Studies in Qur'anic Language and Exegesis

By
Abdul Masih

January 16th 2026

Contents

Preface –P6

Chapter I –P8
The Death of Jesus in the Qur'an and Early Tafsīr

Chapter II –P26
Muhammad and Qur'anic Eschatology

Chapter III –P33
Grammatical Arguments in the Qur'an: Use of the dual form

Chapter IV –P41
Pre-Islamic Narratives, Myths and Rituals within Islam

Chapter V -P80
Bearing the Sins of Others within the Qur'an and Hadith

Epilogue –P90

Preface

One reading the contents of this study can expect a critical examination of the contents within the utmost respected material within the Islamic religion, of course I am speaking of Qur'anic passages and early Muslim interpretations from the Sahabah who are direct followers and companions of Prophet Mohammad.

The methodology of this study solely relies on comprehensive reading of the original Arabic combined with the interpretations of authoritative tafsīr writers and with comparison of multiple translations from native Arabic speakers.

The sole purpose of this study is to give an account from the perspective of an amateur, self proclaimed theologian and historian, particularly one who engages deeply with Sunni Islamic literature. And at that I feel as though it would be appropriate to talk a little bit about myself as I understand that readers may consider the question of bias and perspective. I am a self-proclaimed polemicist, coming from a Christian background, born and raised in Canada. I have been engaging in debates with Muslims on the topic of Islam for about three years, often dedicating significant time and effort to gain an authentic view of this otherworldly religion. At that I consider it important to imply that I have no issue with individual followers, though I am deeply concerned about the practice of what I consider "authentic" Islam within European and Western borders. But that is a separate discussion. With this background, I feel equipped to write this polemical biography on Islam, while remaining fully aware that my evidence is limited to my own knowledge.

Chapter I
The Death of Jesus in the Qur'an and Early Tafsīr

As we start off, I find it important to mention the fact that the Qur'an contains multiple passages dealing explicitly with the death of Jesus Christ in fact it is among the very first things the Islamic Jesus does in his ministry, with that being said it needs to be stated plainly that the Qur'an itself speaks openly about the death of Jesus Christ and it appears immediately after his birth.

In Sūrat Maryam the nineteenth chapter of the Qur'an Jesus declares as a young babe in verse thirty-three to thirty-four.

Peace be upon me the day I was born, the day I die, and the day I am raised alive.

مۡـَ لَّسلاۡ وۡ ّىَ لَعۡ ُمۡوَيۡ ُ تدِل وۡ ُمۡوَيَ وۡ ُ تو مَ أۡ ُمۡوَيَ وۡ ُ ثَعۡب أ اۡ ِّيَح ٣٣ ۡ

(19:33)

The Qur'an then follows this statement by asserting

Such (was) Jesus the son of Mary: (it is) a statement of truth, about which they (vainly) dispute.

كِل ۡ ذ َسيِعۡ ُ نۡبأۡ َ مَي ۡرَمۡ ُ ۡلَوۡ ق ۡ ِ قَحۡ لاۡ ِذَّ لاۡ ُ ِهيِفۡ ُ نو رَتۡمَي ٣٤ ۡ

(19:34)

In these verses the Qur'an does not present the death of Jesus as symbolic language, nor as a hypothetical scenario. It is stated as fact, and it is explicitly defended as truth. It is important to note that this passage is not speaking about a future "second coming," as later Islamic interpretations often attempt to argue.

The structure of the verse itself does not allow for such a reading. Evidence would lie in the mere fact that the Qur'an offers a clear and uninterrupted timeline for Jesus Christ in this verse: birth, death, resurrection. These are presented as successive events that will lead one after the other. Nothing in the language suggests a return to earth prior to death, nor does the verse hint at a postponed or voided death,

as death comes before the Islamic Jesus says he will be raised alive. To impose a second descent of Jesus into this sequence is not exegesis but interpolation.

This becomes even clearer when the verse is read alongside its literary parallel where earlier in the Surah John the Baptist is described using nearly the same identical literary language

(19:15)

"Peace be upon him the day he was born, and the day of his death, and the day he will be raised back to life!"

١٥ اًّيَحُ ثَعْب يُ َمْوَيُ َو ُتو مَيُ َمْوَيَ وُ ُدِل وُ َمْوَيُ ِهْيَ لَعُ ُ ـلَسَو

No Muslim scholar/interpreter/writer argues that John the Baptist will return to earth, die again, and then be resurrected.

His life follows the exact pattern stated birth, death, resurrection. The Qur'an is deliberately using the same language to show similarity in comparison, as both figures are presented in the same chapter to be speaking miraculously after birth concerning their lives and how they will die just like every other human being.

To claim that Jesus' statement refers to a second coming while John's does not is to invite double standards that the Qur'an itself does not support. If it be true that the claim of earthly death is fact and literal in the case of John then it must be treated the same in the case of Jesus. This would be an honest approach to literary language.

What I also find quite striking about *(19:33)* is the near-total agreement among translators regarding its meaning,

take for instance the fact that Sahih International, Yusuf Ali, Maududi, Pickthall, Muhsin Khan, Abdel Haleem, and others all agree and render the verse in the same plain sequence despite the fact that they come from different backgrounds, schools, and orientations,

TRANSLATIONS https://myislam.org/surah-maryam/ayat-33/

Sahih International
"And peace is on me the day I was born and the day I 1 will die and the day I am raised alive."

Yusuf Ali
"So peace is on me the day I was born, the day that I die, and the day that I shall be raised up to life (again)"!

Abul Ala Maududi
"Peace be upon me the day I was born and the day I will die, and the day I will be raised up alive."

Muhsin Khan "And Salam
"(peace) be upon me the day I was born, and the day I die, and the day I shall be raised alive!"

Pickthall
"Peace on me the day I was born, and the day I die, and the day I shall be raised alive!"

Dr. Ghali
"And peace be upon me, the day I was born, and the day I die, and the day I am made to rise again alive."

The earliest tradition of the followers of the prophet only strengthens this reading. Take for instance the tafsīr attributed to Ibn ʿAbbās, who himself is widely regarded within Sunni Islam as the earliest interpreter of the Qur'an and the renowned cousin of the prophet.

At that, it is worth noting that the tafsīr attributed to Ibn ʿAbbās, Tanwīr al-Miqbās is frequently dismissed by later Muslim scholars as partially unreliable, yet almost every renowned tafsir writer has zero hesitation in quoting Ibn ʿAbbās extensively in their own work often repeating the very interpretations found within Tanwīr al Miqbās.
So it is important that one does excessive and exhausting research before quoting from it, that being said Qur'an 19:33 is taken in its most literal sense as Ibn ʿAbbās explains the verse as follows:
(Peace on me the day I was born) safety to me from Satan's touch when I was born, (and the day I die) and safety to me from the compression of the grave when die, (and the day I shall be raised alive) when I am resurrected alive from the grave!)
https://quranx.com/tafsirs/19.33

This is not only significant because of what Ibn ʿAbbās says but because of who Ibn ʿAbbās was within the early religion of Islam, as Ibn ʿAbbās himself declared that the Messenger of Allah placed his hand upon him and prayed,
"O Allah, give him understanding in religion and teach him the interpretation of the Qur'an."
This report, graded strong (qawī) by al-Arna'ut, is frequently cited to establish Ibn ʿAbbās as the foremost early authority in Qur'anic interpretation.
https://www.abuaminaelias.com/dailyhadithonline/2012/0 8/16/ibn-abbas-tafsir-quran/

When such a figure understands Jesus' words as referring to real death, burial, and resurrection, the reading should not be dismissed lightly and should be held as more authentic than later interpretations that arrived centuries after Islam.

At that I do see it fit to now pivot to what actually happens to the Islamic Jesus and to give a clear and coherent narrative to what actually transpired and occurred. To start it is essential to bring up the fact that the death of Jesus is directly addressed in surah-Ali Imran ayat 55 *(3:55)*

Behold! Allah said: "O Jesus! I will cause you to die and raise thee to Myself and clear thee (of the falsehoods) of those who blaspheme; I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection: Then shall ye all return unto me, and I will judge between you of the matters wherein ye dispute.

Ith qala Allahu yaAAeesa innee mutawaffeeka warafiAAuka ilayya wamutahhirukamina allatheena kafaroo wajaAAilu allatheenaittabaAAooka fawqa allatheena kafaroo ila yawmialqiyamati thumma ilayya marjiAAukum faahkumubaynakum feema kuntum feehi takhtalifoon

Firstly it is important to address that the root word of *mutawaffeeka* literally means
“to cause to die” or “to take completely.”
In fact, over 90% of the Qur’anic instances of this root word being used is in the context of an actual death whether describing the Angel of Death taking a soul or God fulfilling the end of a life.

Verb (form V) - to pass away, to die

(2:234:2) *yutawaffawna*	pass away	وَالَّذِينَ **يُتَوَفَّوْنَ** مِنْكُمْ وَيَذَرُونَ أَزْوَاجًا يَتَرَبَّصْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ أَرْبَعَةَ أَشْهُرٍ وَعَشْرًا
(2:240:2) *yutawaffawna*	die	وَالَّذِينَ **يُتَوَفَّوْنَ** مِنْكُمْ وَيَذَرُونَ أَزْوَاجًا وَصِيَّةً لِأَزْوَاجِهِمْ
(3:193:18) *watawaffanā*	and cause us to die	رَبَّنَا فَاغْفِرْ لَنَا ذُنُوبَنَا وَكَفِّرْ عَنَّا سَيِّئَاتِنَا **وَتَوَفَّنَا** مَعَ الْأَبْرَارِ
(4:15:16) *yatawaffāhunna*	comes to them	فَأَمْسِكُوهُنَّ فِي الْبُيُوتِ حَتَّىٰ **يَتَوَفَّاهُنَّ** الْمَوْتُ
(4:97:3) *tawaffāhumu*	take them (in **death**)	إِنَّ الَّذِينَ **تَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ قَالُوا فِيمَ كُنْتُمْ
(5:117:20) *tawaffaytanī*	You raised me	فَلَمَّا **تَوَفَّيْتَنِي** كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ
(6:60:3) *yatawaffākum*	takes your (soul)	وَهُوَ الَّذِي **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** بِاللَّيْلِ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا جَرَحْتُمْ بِالنَّهَارِ
(6:61:13) *tawaffathu*	take him	حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَ أَحَدَكُمُ الْمَوْتُ **تَوَفَّتْهُ** رُسُلُنَا وَهُمْ لَا يُفَرِّطُونَ
(7:37:20) *yatawaffawnahum*	(to) take them in **death**	حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَتْهُمْ رُسُلُنَا **يَتَوَفَّوْنَهُمْ** قَالُوا أَيْنَ مَا كُنْتُمْ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ
(7:126:15) *watawaffanā*	and cause us to die	رَبَّنَا أَفْرِغْ عَلَيْنَا صَبْرًا **وَتَوَفَّنَا** مُسْلِمِينَ
(8:50:4) *yatawaffā*	take away souls	وَلَوْ تَرَىٰ إِذْ **يَتَوَفَّى** الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا الْمَلَائِكَةُ يَضْرِبُونَ وُجُوهَهُمْ وَأَدْبَارَهُمْ وَذُوقُوا عَذَابَ الْحَرِيقِ
(10:46:7) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	وَإِمَّا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِلَيْنَا مَرْجِعُهُمْ
(10:104:21) *yatawaffākum*	causes you to die	وَلَٰكِنْ أَعْبُدُ اللَّهَ الَّذِي **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ**
(12:101:18) *tawaffanī*	Cause me to die	**تَوَفَّنِي** مُسْلِمًا وَأَلْحِقْنِي بِالصَّالِحِينَ
(13:40:8) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	وَإِنْ مَا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَعَلَيْنَا الْحِسَابُ
(16:28:2) *tatawaffāhumu*	take them in **death**	الَّذِينَ **تَتَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ
(16:32:2) *tatawaffāhumu*	take them in **death**	الَّذِينَ **تَتَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ طَيِّبِينَ يَقُولُونَ سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكُمُ
(16:70:4) *yatawaffākum*	will cause you to die	وَاللَّهُ خَلَقَكُمْ ثُمَّ **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ أَرْذَلِ الْعُمُرِ
(22:5:43) *yutawaffā*	dies	وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ **يُتَوَفَّىٰ** وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ أَرْذَلِ الْعُمُرِ
(32:11:2) *yatawaffākum*	Will take your soul	قُلْ **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** مَلَكُ الْمَوْتِ الَّذِي وُكِّلَ بِكُمْ
(39:42:2) *yatawaffā*	takes	اللَّهُ **يَتَوَفَّى** الْأَنْفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا وَالَّتِي لَمْ تَمُتْ فِي مَنَامِهَا
(40:67:23) *yutawaffā*	dies	وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ **يُتَوَفَّىٰ** مِنْ قَبْلُ وَلِتَبْلُغُوا أَجَلًا مُسَمًّى وَلَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ
(40:77:12) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	فَإِمَّا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِلَيْنَا يُرْجَعُونَ
(47:27:3) *tawaffathumu*	take them in **death**	فَكَيْفَ إِذَا **تَوَفَّتْهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ يَضْرِبُونَ وُجُوهَهُمْ وَأَدْبَارَهُمْ

What is also astonishing about the verse is that every translator, from Muhammad Asad to *The Wise Qur'an*, renders Qur'an 3:55 in virtually the same way, all stating that God tells Jesus, that he will cause him to die and raise him to himself, all simultaneously agreeing on the essential fact that Jesus dies before being raised back to life.

QUR'AN TRANSLATIONS
https://www.islamawakened.com/quran/3/55/default.h tm#gsc.tab=0

Muhammad Asad
"Lo! God said: "O Jesus! Verily, I shall cause thee to die, and shall exalt thee unto Me,"

Safi Kaskas
"God said, "Jesus, I will cause you to die and raise you up to me,"
Wahiduddin Khan " God said, O Jesus, I shall cause you to die and will raise you up to Me"

Shabbir Ahmed
"O Jesus! I will cause you to die of natural causes and I will exalt you in honor in My Court and I will clear you of the slander of the disbelievers."

Abdul Majid Daryabadi
"Recall what time Allah said: O 'Isa! verily I shall make thee die, and am lifting thee to myself" Ali

Bakhtiari Nejad
"(Remember) when God said: "Jesus, I make you die, and bring you up to Me"

Mohammad Shafi
”When Allah said: "O Jesus! I am indeed going to make you die and raise you up to Me.”

Maulana Muhammad Ali
”When Allah said: O Jesus, I will cause thee to die and exalt thee in My presence”

Muhammad Ahmed & Samira
”When God said: "You Jesus I am, I am making you die and raising you to Me”

Sher Ali
”Remember the time when ALLAH said' `O Jesus, I will cause thee to die a natural death and will raise thee to Myself,”

Amatul Rahman Omar
”when Allah said, `O Jesus! I will cause you to die a natural death, and will exalt you to Myself”

George Sale
”When God said, O Jesus, verily I will cause thee to die, and I will take thee up unto me”

Edward Henry Palmer
”When God said, 'O Jesus! I will make Thee die and take Thee up again to me”

John Medows Rodwell
"Remember when God said, "O Jesus! verily I will cause thee to die, and will take thee up to myself"

Shuaib Abdullahi
"GOD (Ellahu) said (Qaala), "O (Yaa) Jesus (Eesaa), indeed I (Innii) will cause you to die (Mutawaffii-ka) and (Wa) raise you (Raafiu'ka) to ME"

Ahmed Hulusi
"And recall when Allah had said, "I'm going to cause you to die (that is, they will not be able to assassinate you through their secret schemes, I will cause you to die when your time comes) I'm going to raise you to myself"

The Wise Quran
"And when God said, 'O Jesus! Indeed, I will cause you to die and raise you to me and purify you of those who disbelieved,"

This overwhelming linguistic and translational agreement leaves little room for the popular apologetic notion that Jesus never died. Having established the literal meaning of mutawaffīka and the overwhelming agreement among translators that Jesus dies before being raised, we now turn to the earliest tafsīr evidence starting with Qurtubi, who cites Ibn ʿAbbās to see how the companions themselves understood this verse.
Ibn Talhah narrated from Ibn Abbas that the meaning of Mutawwafika is that He causes you to die. Ar-Rabi' ibn Anas said: It is a death of sleep.
القرآن الكريم - تفسير القرطبي - تفسير سورة آل عمران - الآية 55

The overwhelming weight of evidence supports the literal understanding. Ibn ʿAbbās, who is regarded as one of the most authoritative companions for Qur'anic interpretation, consistently treats

mutawaffika as an actual death, this is the overwhelming weight of evidence that supports the literal understanding.

As Ibn ʿAbbās, is regarded as one of the most authoritative companions for Qur'anic interpretation. Next we have Ibn Kathir, one of the most cited and influential mufassirīn, who himself reinforces the literal meaning of death in 3:55. Evidence for this claim lies within the fact he not only quotes ibn abbas in saying that Allah will cause Jesus to die before the action of raising but also quotes a certain Ibn Ishaq who himself wrote the earliest biography of the prophet in saying Allah caused Jesus to die for three hours during the day he was raised up to himself.

Ali bin Abi Talha said on the authority of Ibn Abbas:
{Indeed, I will take you} means: I will cause you to die. Muhammad bin Ishaq said, on the authority of someone who is not accused, on the authority of Wahb bin Munabbih, who said: Allah caused him to die for three hours during the day when He raised him to Himself.
https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/katheer/sura3 aya55.html

Moving onto Al-Tabari, who himself is one of the earliest and most exhaustive mufassirīn, whom also leaves no ambiguity, making mention of the numerous authentic chains that agree that the taking of Jesus was an actual death from this world.

Ali bin Sahl narrated to us, he said, Damrah bin Rabi'ah narrated to us, on the authority of Ibn Shawdhab, on the authority of Matar al-Warraq, regarding the statement of Allah: "Indeed, I will cause you to die," he said: I will cause you to die from this world
Al-Hasan bin Yahya narrated to us, he said, Abd al-Razzaq informed us, he said, Muammar informed us, on the authority of Al-Hasan, regarding His statement:"Indeed, I will cause you to die," he said: I will cause you to die from the earth.
Al-Qasim narrated to us, he said, Al-Husayn narrated to us, he said,

Hajjaj narrated to me, on the authority of Ibn Jurayj, regarding His statement: "Indeed, I will cause you to die and raise you to Myself and purify you from those who disbelieve," he said: So He raised him to Himself, meaning He caused him to die and purified him from those who disbelieved.
Others said: The meaning of that is: I will take you in the death of death.
Al- Muthanna told me, he said, Abdullah bin Saleh told us, he said, Muawiyah told me, on the authority of Ali, on the authority of Ibn Abbas, regarding his statement, "I will cause you to die," meaning: I will cause you to die.
Ibn Humayd told us, he said, Salamah told us, on the authority of Ibn Ishaq, on the authority of someone who is not accused, on the authority of Wahb bin Munabbih Al-Yamani, that he said: God caused Jesus, son of Mary, to die for three hours during the day until He raised him up to Himself.
https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/tabary/sura3 aya55.html#tabary

Next we have Al-Baghawi whom himself is a highly influential Persian Sunni Muslim scholar and expert in Qur'anic exegesis whom is also commonly referred to as Muhyi al-Sunnah, Reviver of the Prophetic Tradition. Which is even greater when I make mention on how he reports on authentic chains that are on the authority of the revered Sunni Ali Bin Talha whom Sunnis honor as the fourth Rightly Guided Caliph going all the way back to the prophets cousin Ibn Abbas stating that Jesus was taken by the *"Angel of death"*

It was narrated on the authority of Ali bin Talha, on the authority of

Ibn Abbas, may God be pleased with them both, that its meaning is: I will cause you to die, as indicated by the words of God Almighty: "Say: The Angel of Death will take you" (32:11). Based on this, it has two interpretations: One of them is what Wahb said: God caused Jesus to die for three hours of the day, then God raised him up to Himself.
https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/baghawy/sura3 aya55.html#baghawy

Now it is time to do some traditional polemics on some of the assertions that are made by modern Muslims on (Quran 4:157-158)
That they said (in boast), "We killed Christ Jesus the son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah";- but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear so, and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjecture to follow, for of a surety they killed him not:- Nay, Allah raised him up unto Himself; and Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise;

Modern Muslim apologists will use these verses to state that Jesus did not experience death and was not crucified, and then will assert that someone else was made to look like Jesus offering theories of substitution and conclude that Jesus was raised without death, to combat these claims one has to understand the literary context of the claim that these events were made to appear to happen, As one can assert that Jesus truly did experience death the day he was raised to Allah with the harmonizing factor of *3:55* where I already demonstrated how Jesus experienced death when he was raised to Allah. However the best way to combat these claims is to explain the context of the verse. Jews were making the claim that Jesus was dead during the time the prophet was living, where he combated their saying implying that Jesus appeared to go through these things, crucifixion, death, but was then raised to Allah, and that factor is even more destructive to the modern narrative of Jesus not experiencing death.
The fact that Jesus was a martyr and the fact Mohammad combated the

Jewish claims with the mere assertion that Jesus is alive and has a unique closeness with Allah is more devastating when we harmonize the Qur'an with 3:169 where martyrs are not supposed to be seen as dead but as alive and close with their lord

Do not think those who are killed in the way of Allah are dead. Rather, they are alive with their Lord, provided for

(3:169)

The verse explicitly makes mention on how martyrs who are killed in the way of Allah are not apparently killed nor thought to be killed. So a martyr who is literally killed and is dead is to be thought of as alive, as here it seems that a believer is commanded to not to regard the martyr as dead but to say they are alive with their lord, which is exactly what Mohammad did with the Jews for their saying that Jesus was killed and crucified.

Which then brings me to where the root word of *Mutawwafika* is used again in the Qur'an in a conversation between Allah and Jesus Qur'an *(5:117)*

Ma qultu lahum illa maamartanee bihi ani oAAbudoo Allaha rabbee warabbakumwakuntu AAalayhim shaheedan ma dumtu feehim falammatawaffaytanee kunta anta arraqeeba AAalayhim waanta AAalakulli shay-in shaheed

Never said I to them aught except what Thou didst command me to say, to wit, 'worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord'; and I was a witness over them whilst I dwelt amongst them; when Thou didst cause me to die Thou wast the Watcher over them, and Thou art a witness to all things.

This is most destructive, as it is used in the past tense; Jesus plainly declares you did cause me to die describing a completed action and of course using the same literary language as 3:55

where it is unanimously agreed that Jesus experienced death at the disposal of Allah.

What also makes (5:117) so devastating is the near universal agreement

amongst Muslim translators on the matter of *tawaffaytani* meaning to cause death.

TRANSLATIONS

https://www.islamawakened.com/quran/5/117/default.htm#gsc.tab=0

Imam Iskender Ali Mihr

"I spoke to them only that which You commanded me: "Be servants to Allah, My Lord and your Lord". I was a witness over them while I dwelt among them. And when you did cause me to die (when You took me away from them), You were the Watcher over them. And You are Witness over all things."

Amatul Rahman Omar

"I said nothing to them except that what You had commanded me, "Worship Allâh, my Lord as well as your Lord". I was a witness over them (only) so long as I remained among them but ever since You caused me to die, You Yourself have been the Watcher over them and You are the Witness to everything"

Mohammed Habib Shakir

"I did not say to them aught save what Thou didst enjoin me with: That serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord, and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wert the watcher over them, and Thou art witness of all things"

Muhammad Asad

"Nothing did I tell them beyond what Thou didst bid me to say Worship God, who is my Sustainer as well as your Sustainer. And I bore witness to what they did as long as I dwelt in their midst; but since Thou hast caused me to die, Thou alone hast been their keeper: for Thou art witness unto everything"

Safi Kaskas

"I told them only what You commanded me to say, "Worship God, who is my Lord as well as your Lord." I was a witness to them during my time with them. But after you made me die, You were the one watching over them. You witness everything."

Wahiduddin Khan

"I told them only what You commanded me to, Worship God, my Lord and your Lord. I was a witness to what they did as long as I remained among them, and when You did cause me to die, You were the watcher over them. You are the witness of all things"

Shakir

"I did not say to them aught save what Thou didst enjoin me with: That serve Allah, my Lord and your Lord, and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wert the watcher over them, and Thou art witness of all things"

(5:117) becomes even more severe once the earliest layer of Islamic

exegesis is consulted. Take for instance Al-Ṭabarī, whose tafsīr stands at the foundation of the Sunni interpretive tradition which leaves no ambiguity about how the verse was understood. Al-Ṭabarī explicitly explains that God "took Jesus to Himself and caused him to die.

Abu Ja`far said: This is a report from God , the Exalted, about the words of Jesus, saying: I said to them nothing except what You commanded me to say to them , which is that I said to them: "Worship God, my Lord and your Lord" = "and I was a witness over them as long as I was among them," meaning: I was a witness over what they did while I was among them, and over their actions and words (21) = "and when You took me ," meaning: (22) = "You were the Observer over them," meaning: You were the Guardian over them, not me, (23) because I only witnessed their deeds and what they did while I was among them. This clarifies that God, the Exalted, mentioned Him, only made him aware of the people's deeds and words after He took him to Him and caused him to die
https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/tabary/sura5 aya117.html#tabary

Results 1 to 24 of 24 for pos:v (v) root:وفي (in 0.005 seconds):

(2:234:2) *yutawaffawna*	pass away	وَالَّذِينَ **يُتَوَفَّوْنَ** مِنْكُمْ وَيَذَرُونَ أَزْوَاجًا يَتَرَبَّصْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ أَرْبَعَةَ أَشْهُرٍ وَعَشْرًا
(2:240:2) *yutawaffawna*	die	وَالَّذِينَ **يُتَوَفَّوْنَ** مِنْكُمْ وَيَذَرُونَ أَزْوَاجًا وَصِيَّةً لِأَزْوَاجِهِمْ
(3:193:18) *watawaffanā*	and cause us to die	رَبَّنَا فَاغْفِرْ لَنَا ذُنُوبَنَا وَكَفِّرْ عَنَّا سَيِّئَاتِنَا **وَتَوَفَّنَا** مَعَ الْأَبْرَارِ
(4:15:16) *yatawaffāhunna*	comes to them	فَأَمْسِكُوهُنَّ فِي الْبُيُوتِ حَتَّىٰ **يَتَوَفَّاهُنَّ** الْمَوْتُ
(4:97:3) *tawaffāhumu*	take them (in **death**)	إِنَّ الَّذِينَ **تَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ قَالُوا فِيمَ كُنْتُمْ
(5:117:20) *tawaffaytanī*	You raised me	فَلَمَّا **تَوَفَّيْتَنِي** كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ
(6:60:3) *yatawaffākum*	takes your (soul)	وَهُوَ الَّذِي **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** بِاللَّيْلِ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا جَرَحْتُمْ بِالنَّهَارِ
(6:61:13) *tawaffathu*	take him	حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَ أَحَدَكُمُ الْمَوْتُ **تَوَفَّتْهُ** رُسُلُنَا وَهُمْ لَا يُفَرِّطُونَ
(7:37:20) *yatawaffawnahum*	(to) take them in **death**	حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَتْهُمْ رُسُلُنَا **يَتَوَفَّوْنَهُمْ** قَالُوا أَيْنَ مَا كُنْتُمْ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ
(7:126:15) *watawaffanā*	and cause us to die	رَبَّنَا أَفْرِغْ عَلَيْنَا صَبْرًا **وَتَوَفَّنَا** مُسْلِمِينَ
(8:50:4) *yatawaffā*	take away souls	وَلَوْ تَرَىٰ إِذْ **يَتَوَفَّى** الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا الْمَلَائِكَةُ يَضْرِبُونَ وُجُوهَهُمْ وَأَدْبَارَهُمْ وَذُوقُوا عَذَابَ الْحَرِيقِ
(10:46:7) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	وَإِمَّا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِلَيْنَا مَرْجِعُهُمْ
(10:104:21) *yatawaffākum*	causes you to die	وَلَٰكِنْ أَعْبُدُ اللَّهَ الَّذِي **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ**
(12:101:18) *tawaffanī*	Cause me to die	**تَوَفَّنِي** مُسْلِمًا وَأَلْحِقْنِي بِالصَّالِحِينَ
(13:40:8) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	وَإِنْ مَا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَعَلَيْنَا الْحِسَابُ
(16:28:2) *tatawaffāhumu*	take them in **death**	الَّذِينَ **تَتَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ
(16:32:2) *tatawaffāhumu*	take them in **death**	الَّذِينَ **تَتَوَفَّاهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ طَيِّبِينَ يَقُولُونَ سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكُمُ
(16:70:4) *yatawaffākum*	will cause you to die	وَاللَّهُ خَلَقَكُمْ ثُمَّ **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ أَرْذَلِ الْعُمُرِ
(22:5:43) *yutawaffā*	dies	وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ **يُتَوَفَّىٰ** وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ أَرْذَلِ الْعُمُرِ
(32:11:2) *yatawaffākum*	Will take your soul	قُلْ **يَتَوَفَّاكُمْ** مَلَكُ الْمَوْتِ الَّذِي وُكِّلَ بِكُمْ
(39:42:2) *yatawaffā*	takes	اللَّهُ **يَتَوَفَّى** الْأَنْفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا وَالَّتِي لَمْ تَمُتْ فِي مَنَامِهَا
(40:67:23) *yutawaffā*	dies	وَمِنْكُمْ مَنْ **يُتَوَفَّىٰ** مِنْ قَبْلُ وَلِتَبْلُغُوا أَجَلًا مُسَمًّى وَلَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ
(40:77:12) *natawaffayannaka*	We cause you to die	فَإِمَّا نُرِيَنَّكَ بَعْضَ الَّذِي نَعِدُهُمْ أَوْ **نَتَوَفَّيَنَّكَ** فَإِلَيْنَا يُرْجَعُونَ
(47:27:3) *tawaffathumu*	take them in **death**	فَكَيْفَ إِذَا **تَوَفَّتْهُمُ** الْمَلَائِكَةُ يَضْرِبُونَ وُجُوهَهُمْ وَأَدْبَارَهُمْ

What finally removes any remaining ambiguity from Qur'an 5:117 is lexical fact, when the Qur'an's own usage of the root word of Tawaffaytanee gets exhaustively, and consistently used as a means for causing a soul to die or to be taken in death.

A further, though often overlooked, confirmation of this reading appears in (Qur'an 3:144), a verse revealed in a moment of communal crisis after the Prophet's reported death. The Qur'an reminds the believers that Muhammad is only a messenger, and that messengers before him have already passed away, What makes Qur'an 3:144 more damaging than it first appears is the sole fact that it destroys the assumption that a true prophet must be preserved from death to retain honor which will be helpful against some polemical claims you will hear the common Muslim make.

And not mohammad is except a messanger certainly passed away from before him the messangers so if he died or is slain will you turn back on your heels?

ا َمَ و ٌ دَّمَحُم ٌّ لِّ إ ٌ لوُسَر ٌ دَق ٌ لَخ نِم ٍهِل بَق ُّلُسُّرلا ٌّ ۚ نْ ي ِ إَف َ أ ٌّتَاَّم ٌ وَ أ ٌّلِت ُق ٌ مُت بَ لَقنا ٌّ ىَ لَع ٌ مُكِ ب بَق ع أ ٌّ ۚ نَمَ و ٌ بِلَقنَي ٌ ىَ لَع ِه ٌّ يَبِقَع نَ لَف ٌّ ي ُّرُض ٌّ لاَّ ا ـ يَش ٌّ ۚ ي ز جَيَسَ و ٌّ لاَّ ني ِ رِك ئَشلاً

(3:144)

CHAPTER II
Muhammad and Qur'anic Eschatology

Now it is time to bring up the fact that the earliest Islamic sources present a consistent narrative that Muhammad and his first followers expected that the end of the world would arrive within their own generation. One of the clearest expressions comes from Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim where the Prophet boldly declared that he and the last hour had been sent with each other like two fingers held together.

This hadith has been reported by Sahl b. Sa'd that he heard Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) as saying:I and the Last Hour are (close to each other) like this (and he, in order to explain it) pointed (by joining his) forefinger, (one) next to the thumb and the middle finger (together).
https://sunnah.com/muslim:2950

The hour was not a far-off event as it was held as an immediate relation to his mission.

Even the Qur'an reinforces the same sense of urgency with unmistakable grammar, take for instance the event where the prophet apparently splits the moon which was a cosmic event that is directly tethered to the end times as a sign of it's nearness and closeness, being done by the prophet himself, might I add being done during the prophets lifetime in the seventh century. Sūrah al-Qamar the 54th chapter of the Qur'an goes on to say in verse one,

"The Hour has drawn near and the moon was split ⌜in two⌝."

The verb iqtarabat (iq'tarabati / Has drawn near) is perfect tense which means the actions are completed or existing in relation to another time, linking past actions to the present, in other words, in this particular case the end has already drawn near, not will draw near.

To be clear the literary style and the context that will soon be examined shows that the events of the end times was believed to have already begun to approach during the life time of the prophet and this verse is abundantly clear of that.
It is important to note that the Qur'an does not hint or even offer a second moon splitting narrative, as plenty of modern Muslim scholars have battled with this and have forced doctrines out of their interpretation that there will be a repeated event of the moon split, despite the literary content of the Qur'an denying such narratives, in fact early Muslim commentator's were quite clear when talking about this matter for instance ibn abbas who was a companion and cousin of the prophet offers a clear tradition that gives an open and shut case, as he provides explicit commentary on Sūrah al-Qamar (54:1).
And from his narration on the authority of Ibn 'Abbas that he said in the interpretation of Allah's saying (The hour drew nigh): '(The hour drew nigh) He says: the coming of the Hour drew nigh by the advent of Muhammad (pbuh) and the coming down of the smock (and the moon was rent in twain) this is also another sign of the closeness of the Day of Judgement.
https://quranx.com/tafsirs/54.1

This explanation directly ties the nearness of the Hour to two events that occurred during the Prophet's lifetime, the advent of Muhammad and the miraculous splitting of the moon.
It is worth noting that Ibn abbas confirmed that the final reckoning had already begun to approach during the Prophet's lifetime. So much so that his commentary doesn't even hint at distant future fulfillment.

The recurring narrative of the end times being presented as a near-approaching event is unmistakable. Take for instance (*Qur'an 21:1)* itself where Mohammad tells his observers and audience of Mecca that mankind's reckoning has drawn near while the audience themselves are yet turning away remaining in "heedlessness."

The time of` people's judgment has drawn near, yet they are heedlessly turning away.

The verse does not warn of a distant apocalypse, rather quite the contrary as Mohammad is quite literally warning his observers of an end times that will happen within their own life time, that they are not recognizing, as the language used is particularly immediate and confrontational as this verse seems to be situating the nearness of the Hour within the lived experience of Muhammad's own bystanders within the seventh century. Yet, more than fourteen centuries later, in the twenty-first century, that reckoning has still not arrived. Giving us a continued absence that exposes a disconnect between the Qur'an's presentation and expectations and historical reality. In conclusion the language that is used in the Qur'an ultimately and correctly becomes misleading. It is precisely this failure of expectation that exposes the often-repeated and now embarrassing title attributed to Muhammad as "the warner." Which brings me to the fact that throughout the Qur'an, Muhammad is repeatedly challenged by his opponents to prove his prophethood through signs and miracles. Yet the Qur'an deflects this claim stating that Mohammad is only a "warner" take for example *(Quran 46:9)*

Say, "I am not the first messenger ever sent, nor do I know what will happen to me or you. I only follow what is revealed to me. And I am only sent with a clear warning."

The reason this is important is because, Mohammad is constantly treated as a warner for the end times throughout both the Qur'an and the sayings and teachings of the prophet. We have seen that Mohammad didn't merely warn us of a distant apocalypse,

rather he saw himself as the final warner standing shoulder to shoulder with the hour itself, as the biggest miracle that is attributed to Mohammad is the splitting of the moon. So yes, he pointed to signs like the splitting of the moon and he told his observers that the reckoning of the end of days was approaching them in the seventh century, but that is not all,

he also destroyed symbols that could only be standing at the end times to show a revival of paganism, of course I am speaking of the pagan shrine known as *Dhū al-Khalāṣa*, which was often referred to as the *Kaʿba of Yemen.* Muhammad is reported to have made a specific end-times prophecy involving the shrines physical integrity during the events that would unfold during the end times, he prophesied that a revival of paganism would revolve around this particular site,
Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said, "The Hour will not be established till the buttocks of the women of the tribe of Daus move while going round Dhi-al-Khalasa." Dhi al-Khalasa was the idol of the Daus tribe which they used to worship in the Pre Islamic Period of ignorance.
Sahih al-Bukhari 7116
https://sunnah.com/bukhari:7116

Yet within the same authentic tradition Muhammad orders the immediate destruction of that very shrine. As a companion of the prophet by the name of Jarīr ibn ʿAbdullāh al-Bajalī recounts that Muhammad instructed him to march against Dhū al-Khalāṣa whereupon mohammad ordered Jarīr ibn ʿAbdullāh al-Bajalī and his men to destroy the temple and kill whoever they found there.

Jarir bin 'Abdullah narrated:There was a house called Dhul-Khalasa in the Pre-lslamic Period and it was also called Al-Ka'ba Al-Yamaniya or Al-Ka'ba Ash-Shamiya. Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said to me, "Will

you relieve me from Dhul-Khalasa?" So I left for it with 150 cavalrymen from the tribe of Ahmas and then we destroyed it and killed whoever we found there. Then we came to the Prophet ((ﷺ and informed him about it. He invoked good upon us and upon the tribe of Ahmas.

Sahih al-Bukhari 3823

https://sunnah.com/bukhari:3823

The prophecy presupposes the continued existence of Dhū al-Khalāṣa into the eschatological period, since a revival of worship cannot occur at a site that no longer exists. Yet Muhammad personally ensures its destruction. the only coherent explanation is that he expected the signs of the Hour to begin unfolding during or shortly after his own lifetime. To make this point explicit and unavoidable, the argument can be stated formally as follows

Premise 1:

According to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, the Prophet Muhammad foretold that one of the signs of the Hour would be that women from the tribe of Daws would dance around and worship Dhū al-Khalāṣa, a pre-Islamic idol.

Premise 2:

In another hadith, also in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Muhammad ordered Dhū al-Khalāṣa to be destroyed. This was carried out by Jarīr ibn ʿAbdullāh al-Bajalī during the Prophet's lifetime.

Premise 3:

A prophet who expects the fulfillment of a sign centuries after his death would not logically take urgent, personal military action against the condition required for that sign, as such a prophecy would be temporally distant and would not require immediate intervention.

Conclusion:

Therefore, Muhammad's prophecy concerning Dhū al-Khalāṣa, combined with his decision to destroy it during his lifetime, indicates that he expected the signs of the end times to begin unfolding within or shortly after his own lifetime.

This expectation of imminence is made explicit in another hadith which has an authentic narration that has been preserved in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, which seems to liken the coming of the Hour in terms of a single human lifespan where Muhammad himself implied that the end would occur before a child who was present while he was speaking would reach old age.

Anas b. Malik reported that a person asked Allah's Apostle (ﷺ (:When would the Last Hour come? Thereupon Allah's Messenger (way peace be upon him) kept quiet for a while. Then looked at a young boy in his presence belonging to the tribe of Azd Shanu'a and he said: If this boy lives he would not grow very old till the Last Hour would come to you. Anas said that this young boy was of our age during those days.

Sahih Muslim 2953b

https://sunnah.com/muslim:2953b

Every one of these elements that i have brought up in this chapter is rooted in the most authoritative sources and speaks and illuminate each other on the fact that the end was expected to unfold soon after or during the Prophets lifetime. The literary language is not vague. And the grammar is not ambiguous. The expectation was most concrete, urgent, and immediate. Yet fourteen centuries have passed, and the hour has not arrived. Time itself has become the most valued critic on my behalf and assuredly made it quite easy to demonstrate how flawed the Qur'anic expectations are, an all knowing god prescribing the end times to be near in the seventh century is most damning as we get more distant from that ancient time In fact with every minute that passes and as time continues the more the original message of imminence stands exposed.

Chapter III
Grammatical Arguments in the Qur'an:
Use of the dual form

I have engaged with Muslims on this subject intensively for roughly over a year, often in forceful and sustained debate. Even so, it is precisely because of that prolonged engagement that I believe this topic must be approached with the seriousness and respect it warrants.
As this line of argument has been advanced and defended by figures who are well known within Christian apologetics and beyond my league. Firstly, we have Sam Shamoun, a widely respected catholic apologist has articulated this critique alongside others such as GodLogic, Christian Prince, Rob Christian, and David Wood. The argument itself, however, predates all of them. These names are mentioned not as an appeal to authority, but to situate the discussion within the realm it exists and has existed. Now with that being said we can introduce the Qur'anic text to the discussion in surah nine we have in verse thirty-one,
"They have taken their scholars and their monks as lords besides Allah and the Messiah, son of Mary And they were not commanded except to worship one God; there is no deity except Him. Exalted is He above whatever they associate with Him."
Ittakhathoo ahbarahumwaruhbanahum arbaban min dooni Allahi WALMASEEHAIBNA maryama wama omiroo illa liyaAAbudoo ilahanwahidan la ilaha illa huwa subhanahuAAamma yushrikoon.

In this particular verse we have Allah condemning Jews for taking their monks and their rabbis as lords, and it suggests in the literal sense that they should have been taking Allah and the messiah as the true lords as it states,
"arbaban min dooni Allahi WALMASEEHAIBNA maryama."

One may object that the verse speaks of lords in the plural and that Allah remains singular in His lordship as it says

“they were not commanded except to worship one God”

That point, however, does not address the issue under consideration. The argument is not concerned with numerical plurality, but in the manner by which Allah structures the statement. In this verse, Allah is joined with the Messiah through the conjunction و (wa) within a single construction governed by min dūni (“besides”). This is precisely the type of grammatical association that Muhammad himself treated as impermissible when it appeared in speech. Of course that was after the fact the Prophet himself was condemned by none other a Jew for using the same grammatical error in his own language, this is according to the Muslims most respected literature take for example the authentic hadith narration that was preserved in Sunan an-Nasāʾī who himself is a prominent Islamic scholar known for his meticulous hadith compilation, which is considered one of the six major Sunni collections.

It was narrated from 'Abdullah bin Yasar, from Qutailah, a woman from Juhainah, that a Jew came to the Prophet and said: "You are setting up rivals (to Allah) and associating others (with Him). You say: 'Whatever Allah wills and you will,' and you say: 'By the Ka'bah.'" So the Prophet commanded them, if they wanted to swear an oath, to say: "By the Lord of the Ka'bah;" and to say: "Whatever Allah wills, then what you will."

Sunan an-Nasa'i 3773

Sunan an-Nasa'i 3773 - The Book of Oaths and Vows - كتاب الأيمان والنذور - Sunnah.com - Sayings and Teachings of Prophet Muhammad ((صلى الله عليه و سلم

The relevance of this narration lies in the simple fact that the correction itself demonstrates that the Jew recognized Muhammad as committing a linguistic error that effectively placed himself alongside Allah in lordship. On the contrary of the fact that no act of worship or explicit claim of divinity or intention of equality was involved as the accusation lied

entirely on grammatical structure as Muhammad had joined himself with Allah using the conjunction “and” (و , wa)
“You are setting up rivals (to Allah) and associating others (with Him). You say: 'Whatever Allah wills and you will,”

One may attempt to deflect this argument by claiming that the prohibition concerns only the joining of wills and that Qur’an 9:31 differs because it addresses lordship rather than volition.
This objection, however, is undermined by later prophetic corrections, which extend the principle beyond matters of will into all forms of grammatical association implying the use of the conjunction “and” for example in Sunan an-Nasāʾī we have hadiths that state:
It was narrated that 'Adiy bin Hatim said: “Two men recited a Tashahhud before the Prophet and one of them said: 'Whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has been guided aright and whoever disobeys them has gone astray.' The Messenger of Allah said: 'What a bad speaker you are!'"
Sunan an-Nasa'i 3279 - The Book of Marriage - كتاب النكاح - Sunnah.com - Sayings and Teachings of Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم)

The significance of this hadith lies in the fact that it extends the corrective principle beyond matters of will. As the speaker was not discussing volition, he simply joined Allah and His Messenger under a single grammatical construction with the conjunction “and.” Yet the Prophet rebuked him, saying: ***“What a bad speaker you are!***
This demonstrates that the rule Muhammad enforced was grammatical and universal, applying to any context in which Allah is joined with another agent. Yet in Qur’an 9:31 Allah employs precisely this type of construction as Allah is joined with the Messiah through ***wa*** in a single frame governed by ***min dūni (“besides”),*** and the category worse of all is involved in lordship. On that thought,
I see it fit to mention the parallel between the grammatical error

Muhammad himself made and then corrected and the grammatical error Allah makes. I do want to make it clear that an apologist can be confident in the precise claim that ***Wa*** implies equality, in which would imply that Qur'an 9:31 linguistically associates Allah with the Messiah in lordship. To make this claim more concrete, we turn to classical Muslim scholarship solely relying on the work of

Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ ibn Mūsā al-Yaḥṣubī

one of the most respected Mālikī jurists, hadith scholars, and historians of the Maghrib, whom was renowned for his profound learning and who provides in his work Ash-Shifā, many quotes from many renowned scholars who offer explicit guidance on this matter. starting off we have Hudhayfa one of the Prophet's most trusted and secretive companions. who states,

Hudhayfa said that the Prophet said, "None of you should say, 'What Allah wills and (wa) so-and-so wills.' Rather say, 'What Allah wills.' Then stop and say, 'So-and-so wills.'

Hudhayfa's report is further clarified by al-Khattabi, whom is a renowned Sunni Islamic scholar from Sijistan, famous for his contributions to Hadith sciences who explains

"Al-Khattabi said, "The Prophet has guided you to correct behaviour in putting the will of Allah before the will of others. He chose 'then' (thumma) which implies sequence and deference as opposed to 'and' (wa) which implies partnership."

This is most damaging as al khattabi directly says that the Prophet explicitly links the dual form ***(wa)*** as implying partnership as in the most famous sense ***"shirk."*** This is the exact type of construction that Qur'an 9:31 employs when Allah joins Himself with the Messiah in lordship.

Ash-Shifa also explicitly mentions the forementioned story of Sunan an-Nasa'i 3279 stating

Something similar is mentioned in another hadith. Someone was speaking in the presence of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and said, "Whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has been rightly guided, and whoever rebels against them both (joining them together by using the dual form)..." The Prophet said to him, "What a bad speaker you are! Get up! [Or he said: Get out!]

This narration is further clarified by Abu Sulayman al Khattabi, a respected classical scholar known for his expertise in hadith and linguistic analysis. As he explains,

Abu Sulayman said, "He disliked the two names being joined together in that way because it implies equality." Someone else thought that what he disliked was stopping at "whoever rebels against them". Abu Sulayman's statement is sounder since it is related in another sound recension of the hadith that he said, "Whoever rebels against them has erred," without stopping after "...whoever rebels against them."

https://ia601303.us.archive.org/15/items/MuhammadMessengerOfAllahAshShifaOfQadiIyad/Muhammad%20Messenger%20of%20Allah%20-%20Ash-shifa%20of%20Qadi%20Iyad.pdf

Page 11-12

All of these statements are reinforced in Major Sunan of An Nasāʾī (10755),

which reports Hudhayfa as saying that the

Messenger of Allah had said Do not say: What Allah wills and what so-and-so wills; rather say: What Allah wills, then what so-and-so wills

The version cited comes from the Encyclopedia of Translated Prophetic Hadiths, a modern resource that collects authentic narrations along with explanations and commentary. That being said the encyclopedia had given they're very own interpretation which is quite damning

The Prophet (may Allah's peace and blessings be upon him) forbids Muslims from saying: "What Allah wills and what so and-so wills" in their speech, or saying: "What Allah wills and so-and-so". This is because Allah's will and determination are absolute and none shares them with Him. but using the conjunctive "and" denotes associating someone with Allah and regarding them as equals. However, one should say: What Allah wills, then what so-and-so wills; thus, making the slave's will subordinate to Allah's will by saying "then" instead of "and", since "then" denotes sequence with a gap in time between the two things in sequence.

Hadith: Do not say: What Allah wills and what so-and-so wills; rather say: What Allah wills then what so-and-so wills - Encyclopedia of Translated Prophetic Hadiths

All the evidence is provided for, and it is now necessary to arrive at a conclusion. The use of the conjunction ***wa ("and")*** to join Allah with another agent is consistently condemned and understood to be shirk, as it provides a linguistic form of association or equality, I have provided evidence for the following information, that Muhammad himself was corrected for using such language, then the companions were corrected for using the conjunction. and classical scholars repeatedly emphasize its understanding of meaning shirk. Yet in **Qur'an 9:31**, Allah does precisely what Muhammad forbade. As He joins Himself with the Messiah using the same condemned speech.

One might attempt to defend Qur'an 9:31 by claiming that the grammatical structure merely associates the Messiah with the monks and rabbis, and thus no real equivalence with Allah is implied. However, such a defense quickly collapses under scrutiny and cross examination. First,

the claim ignores the phonetic and morphological realities of Arabic. The word ***al-Masih*** cannot be pronounced in a way that is similar to **I-lahi**, as **Masih** is a borrowed term from Hebrew, and it carries a terminal ***ha/hu*** that distinguishes it from Allah. To argue that it could somehow be treated identically to Allah in a grammatical sense is absurd and portrays a profound misunderstanding of the Arabic language

(3:45:11) *l-masīḥu*	(is) the Messiah	إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُبَشِّرُكِ بِكَلِمَةٍ مِنْهُ اسْمُهُ الْمَسِيحُ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ
(4:157:4) *l-masīḥa*	the Messiah	وَقَوْلِهِمْ إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا الْمَسِيحَ عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ
(4:171:14) *l-masīḥu*	the Messiah	إِنَّمَا الْمَسِيحُ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَكَلِمَتُهُ أَلْقَاهَا إِلَىٰ مَرْيَمَ
(4:172:3) *l-masīḥu*	the Messiah	لَنْ يَسْتَنْكِفَ الْمَسِيحُ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَبْدًا لِلَّهِ
(5:17:8) *l-masīḥu*	(is) the Messiah	لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ
(5:17:21) *l-masīḥa*	the Messiah	قُلْ فَمَنْ يَمْلِكُ مِنَ اللَّهِ شَيْئًا إِنْ أَرَادَ أَنْ يُهْلِكَ الْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ
(5:72:8) *l-masīḥu*	(is) the Messiah	لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ
(5:72:12) *l-masīḥu*	the Messiah	وَقَالَ الْمَسِيحُ يَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ
(5:75:2) *l-masīḥu*	(is) the Messiah	مَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ
(9:30:8) *l-masīḥu*	Messiah	وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللَّهِ
(9:31:8) *wal-masīḥa*	and the Messiah	اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَالْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ

The second cross examination to such an assertion is the mere fact that Muhammad was illiterate, and the Qur'an originally lacked the diacritical marks ***(ḥarakāt)*** and grammatical annotations that modern readers rely on. The verse would have been rendered simply as

Allāh wal-Masīh

so notice in this skeletal form, the conjunction ***wa*** directly links Allah with the Messiah, which is precisely the type of construction that Muhammad originally got condemned for and later condemned himself. The last point I would make on such a comment is the fact that, the syntactic placement of the Messiah after Allah, even with full grammatical markings, violates the very speech of Mohammad. After correction Muhammad placed Allah first and then separated the agent with ***thumma ("then"),*** signaling deference.

Yet Qur'an 9:31, by contrast, joins Allah and the Messiah with the condemned ***wa***, creating an association in lordship that Muhammad would have and has explicitly corrected if spoken by a human.

Chapter V

Pre-Islamic Narratives, Myths and Rituals within Islam

This chapter will revolve around the thesis that the Qur'an constantly borrows from pre-existing religions, folkloric fables, and myths. Often treating human forged stories as divine fact. Take for example the infancy gospels which is a collection of fables that were fabricated in the name of the apostles of Jesus Christ centuries after their death's. Before I start citing the similarities I have to make mention that the entire first half of both Surat-Maryam and Surah-Ali Imran from verses (1-63) are completely infested with new testament apocryphal writings.
Take for example the scholar ***Gabriel Said Reynolds*** who pointed out in his book written in 2018,
(The Qur'an and the Bible: Text and Commentary) that the Qur'an borrows directly from the Infancy Gospels, a collection of late new testament apocryphal writings that are widely discredited as heresy in Christian tradition and is admitted to be some sort of fabricated legend by numerous scholars. A prime example for it to be discredited comes from early Church authorities as it was condemned by
Pope Innocent I in 405 AD
and later classified as apocryphal and to be avoided by Catholics in the ***Decretum Gelasianum (Gelasian Decree, around AD 500–553)***.
Which was a council that took place roughly 17 to 70 years before the birth of Muhammad. The council makes a firm declaration about the infancy gospels boldly stating,
"not merely rejected but eliminated from the whole Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church and with their authors and the followers of its authors to be damned in the inextricable shackles of anathema forever."
https://www.tertullian.org/decretum_eng.htm
Back to our scholar,

Gabriel Said Reynold
(Professor of Islamic Studies and Theology) and his aforementioned book that was published by *(Yale University Press)* that makes a notable mention on the comparison between the beginning of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas and the mention of Jesus Christ making birds out of clay in (Quran 3:49-5:110)

"***And (make him) a messenger to the Children of Israel (saying): I have come to you with a sign from your Lord, that I determine for you out of dust the form of a bird, then I breathe into it and it becomes a bird with Allah's permission, and I heal the blind and the leprous, and bring the dead to life with Allah's permission; and I inform you of what you should eat and what you should store in your houses. Surely there is a sign in this for you, if you are believers."***

Quran 3:49

/

" [The Day] when Allah will say, "O Jesus, Son of Mary, remember My favor upon you and upon your mother when I supported you with the Pure Spirit and you spoke to the people in the cradle and in maturity; and [remember] when I taught you writing and wisdom and the Torah and the Gospel; and when you designed from clay [what was] like the form of a bird with My permission, then you breathed into it, and it became a bird with My permission; and you healed the blind and the leper with My permission; and when you brought forth the dead with My permission; and when I restrained the Children of Israel from [killing] you when you came to them with clear proofs and those who disbelieved among them said, "This is not but obvious magic.""

5:110

Compare these passages with the Infancy Gospel of Thomas *(150–200 AD)* The beginning of it goes as follows:

"2. This child Jesus, when five years old, was playing in the ford of a mountain stream; and He collected the flowing waters into pools, and made them clear immediately, and by a word alone He made them obey Him. And having made some soft clay, He fashioned out of it twelve sparrows. And it was the Sabbath when He did these things. And there were also many other children playing with Him. And a certain Jew, seeing what Jesus was doing, playing on the Sabbath, went off immediately, and said to his father Joseph: Behold, your son is at the stream, and has taken clay, and made of it twelve birds, and has profaned the Sabbath. And Joseph, coming to the place and seeing, cried out to Him, saying: Why do you do on the Sabbath what it is not lawful to do? And Jesus clapped His hands, and cried out to the sparrows, and said to them: Off you go! And the sparrows flew, and went off crying. And the Jews seeing this were amazed, and went away and reported to their chief men what they had seen Jesus doing."

Firstly I do see it fit to make mention that it was not a surprise to me when I made discovery of how Mohammad first came across these stories mainly due to the literary style of how the Qur'an presented these miracles being done by "Allah's permission". As if the Qur'an was responding to some sort of divinity claim being made on Christ's behalf, as many historians have pointed out that similar stories have been presented to argue a similarity of how God has made Adam *(Genesis 2:7/Quran 15:26/29.)* As even in the Qur'an Allah himself is portrayed doing the very same thing as Jesus, in making Adam out of clay and breathing into him the breath of life.

With that being said it was not a surprise to see that these stories were first presented to Mohammad by a group of sixty *"Christians"* from Najran where gnostic stories like the Infancy Gospels would flourish and were all well known by the 5th century, evidence would be in the fact that the *"Christians"* from Najran brought the very same (human forged stories) for lines of argumentation for the divinity of Christ that the Qur'an endorsed as divine fact, but argues that these miracles were done on Allah's leave. And in my opinion, and I do feel quite confident in this assertion is that these very Infancy Gospel's and similar stories are the direct source for the content of Jesus Christ in the Qur'an, a polemicist could point to the fact that even Ibn Kathir who is one of the most authoritative scholars in Sunni Islamic history makes note of these events transpiring within his very own tafsir on *(Quran 3:61)* where Mohammad attempts to lay a curse *(mubahalla)* upon whoever is telling a lie on the matter of Jesus and offers to lay some sort of death curse upon himself and his close relatives from his daughter to his grandchildren alongside his son in law Ali. *(Quran 3:61)* With that aside the "Christians" who visited Mohammad presented these specific stories for proof of their claims that Jesus was divine,

Indeed, these are the creeds of the Christians. They claim that `Isa is God, since he brought the dead back to life, healed blindness, leprosy and various illnesses, told about matters of the future, created the shape of birds and blew life into them, bringing them to life. However, all these miracles occurred by Allah's leave, so that `Isa would be a sign from Allah for people.

/

***They also claim that `Isa is the son of Allah, since he did not have a father and he spoke when he was in the cradle, a* miracle which had not occurred by any among the Children of Adam before him.**

I do want to make mention that the very stories that these "Christians" presented during their debate were thoroughly denounced as heresy in the Gelasian Decree, around 130–135 years prior to this visit. The council boldly declared that whoever follows these stories are to be anathematized and I quote,

"the followers of its authors to be damned in the inextricable shackles of anathema forever."

That being said I do want to make mention that Ibn kathir also notes that Surah-Ali Imran was deliberately revealed from the beginning of its content all the way up to verse sixty-one as a response to the "Christians" stories, yet the Qur'an seems to adopt them as divine fact as if its author is only concerned with whether or not Jesus was permitted to do these miracles by Allah's authority.

The reason for the call to Mubahalah and the revelation of the Ayat from the beginning of this Surah until here, is that a delegation from the Christians of Najran (in Yemen) came to Al-Madinah to argue about `Isa, claiming that he was divine and the son of Allah. Allah sent down the beginning of this Surah until here, to refute their claims, as Imam Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasar and other scholars stated.

https://quran.com/3:61/tafsirs/en-tafisr-ibn-kathir

These factors come with a conclusion that shows a clear and persistent context of how the Qur'an quite literally treated human forged stories as divine fact, as these stories came from heretics and successfully anathematized themselves during their time spent with the prophet as they presented heretical forged stories that were thoroughly condemned by the church prior to their visit.

and Mohammad merely adopted their tall tales as divine literature presenting each of their stories in his very own Qur'an. To exemplify this I will compare three of the aforementioned notes,

Indeed, these are the creeds of the Christians. They claim that `Isa is God, since he brought the dead back to life, healed blindness, leprosy and various illnesses, told about matters of the future, created the shape of birds and blew life into them, bringing them to life. However, all these miracles occurred by Allah's leave, so that `Isa would be a sign from Allah for people.
/
They also claim that `Isa is the son of Allah, since he did not have a father and he spoke when he was in the cradle, a miracle which had not occurred by any among the Children of Adam before him

Now compare these with the Qur'an's passage in *(5:110)* where the creeds of the "Christians" are directly treated as divine fact only asserting that the miracles had occurred on the authority of Allah.
"[The Day] when Allah will say, "O Jesus, Son of Mary,remember My favor upon you and upon your mother when I supported you with the Pure Spirit and you spoke to the people in the cradle and in maturity; and [remember] when I taught you writing and wisdom and the Torah and the Gospel; and when you designed from clay [what was] like the form of a bird with My permission, then you breathed into it, and it became a bird with My permission; and you healed the blind and the leper with My permission; and when you brought forth the dead with My permission; and when I restrained the Children of Israel from you when you came to them with clear proofs and those who disbelieved among them said, "This is not but obvious magic."
(Quran 5:110)

"So she pointed to the baby. They exclaimed, "How can we talk to someone who is an infant in the cradle?" Jesus declared, "I am truly a servant of Allah. He has destined me to be given the Scripture and to be a prophet. He has made me a blessing wherever I go, and bid me to establish prayer and give alms-tax as long as I live, and to be kind to my mother. He has not made me arrogant or defiant. Peace be upon me the day I was born, the day I die, and the day I will be raised back to life!"

Quran 19:29-33

It would be smart to underline that it would be extremely hard to prove that these "Christians" consciously identified with a particular sect as Najran had various Christian schools of thought. But what is quite verifiable is that the miracle traditions that the "Christians" from Najran presented had already been condemned by the Church and yet they are treated in the Qur'an as historical fact, albeit with a revised theological explanation.

Moving on from the constant influence of the Infancy Gospels, to make a short note on how the Qur'an is somewhat of a reflection of Tatian's very own ***Diatessaron*** considering on how it treats the "injil," the Arabic form for gospel which is derived from the Greek word evangelion *(good news/gospel.)* The **Diatessaron** itself was composed by the pupil of Justin Martyr, Tatian and written around the second century, the book became the standardized text of Edessa and the Syriac Middle East as the dominant Gospel text in the pre-Islamic Arabian environment where Islam emerged. The text itself was a single coherent Gospel narrative where it harmonized the four Gospels into one continuous account. I do have to point out that its influence was inevitable as it was the dominant and standardized text for gospel preaching and teaching within and outside of churches by the 5th century in the regions where Islam flourished, which plausibly explains its influence in the Qur'an,

proof of this influence would be in the fact that the Qur'an itself treats and refers to ***(al-Injīl)*** as a single book given to Jesus, rather than the four separate canonical Gospels. Which is a similarity that I find too striking to be overlooked within this chapter. Another striking adaptation is the complete submission that Mohammad had with the concept of the *Evil Eye* A certain curse that throughout many cultures in ancient history have had their very own version of, and this however was most surprising to me as I was quite familiar with the myth as it predates Islam by a millennia and appears in nearly every ancient culture from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, India, and apparently to the pre-Islamic Arabs, During Mohammads time. Proof of this would in the fact that *Aminah bint Wahb* Mohammad's very own mother used and I quote "Spells" to rid *Mohammad* from the influence of the *Evil Eye* when he was a child as Mohammad was only six years old when Aminah died.

'Ali Halabi, in his Turkish work entitled Insanu'l Uyun, informs us that many people declared that Aminah, Muhammad's mother, used a spell in order to recover him from the influence of the evil eye.

That line was taken directly from the biography of Mohammad written by ***Ali Halabi*** who is A 16th-century scholar from Aleppo, Syria, renowned for his comprehensive biography of the Prophet Muhammad

The reason that this is so compelling is that I would have said that Mohammad's mother's beliefs could have influenced Mohammad profoundly but it was profoundly shocking to me to find out that the entire pre-Islamic Arabic world that surrounded Mohammad were all somewhat endorsing this belief, a prime example would be found in the fact that when Mohammad started receiving revelation his companions all feared that he was suffering from the Evil Eye and even took measures to protect themselves against him as I will demonstrate later on.

Ibn Ishaq says [2] that, before the revelation first began to descend upon him, Muhammad's friends feared that he was suffering from the evil eye: ,and that, when it came upon him, almost the same illness attacked him again.

The superstition was so immensely believed that Mohammads friends even took precautions as they wouldn't even raise their glance towards him in fear of themselves retaining the Evil Eye when he first began to receive revelation.

On the authority of 'Amr ibn Sharhabil it is stated that Muhammad said to Khadijah, "When I was alone I heard a cry: 'O Muhammad, O Muhammad."' In tradition (رواية) it is stated that he said, "I fear lest I should become a magician, lest one should proclaim me a follower of the Jinn"; and again: "I fear lest there should be madness" (or demoniac possession جنون) "in me". After an accession of shivering and shutting his eyes, there used to come over him what resembled a swoon, his face would foam, and he would roar like a young camel: Abu Hurairah say's: "As for the Apostle of God, when inspiration descended on him, no one could raise his glance to him until the inspiration came to an end." In Tradition it is stated that "He was troubled thereat, and his face foamed, and he closed his eyes, and perchance roared like the roaring of the young camel.'
https://answering-islam.org/Books/Pfander/Balance/p346.htm

This assertion comes directly from the way the sentence is structured as it seems that the superstition that had developed seems to evoke itself directly to how the Greeks treated the Evil Eye, take for example the Greek historian and philosopher *Plutarch* who lived around four to five centuries before Mohammad,

who himself wrote of the *Evil Eye* as he was an avid believer of the curse. This of course would show us how people would treat the superstition during his time,

you know very well that it is commonly supposed that some have friends, acquaintances, and even fathers, that have such evil eyes; so that the mothers will not show their children to them, nor for a long time suffer them to be looked upon by such; and how can the effects wrought by these proceed from envy?
https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/goodwin-the-morals-vol-3

Notice how in both cases friends and relatives would not raise a glance towards the afflicted as a means of protection from what both parties sought as a curse that would arise from jealousy or envy. Plutarch himself asserted that it was merely possible to cause harm by a mere glance of an eye and I do believe that the early Muslims during Mohammad's time subscribed to this belief.

Now, when men thus perverted by envy fix their eyes upon another, and these, being nearest to the soul, easily draw the venom from it, and send out as it were poisoned darts, it is no wonder, in my mind, if he that is looked upon is hurt.
https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/goodwin-the-morals-vol-3

Proof of this claim would be in the fact that the Qur'an itself endorses such superstition take for a prime example where Mohammad believes that his bystanders are casting spells on him with their *"looks."*

The disbelievers would almost cut you down with their eyes when they hear ˹you recite˺ the Reminder,1 and say, "He is certainly a madman."
(68:51)

I do see it fit to make mention that even modern translators prescribe the use of "*Evil Eye*" in this passage, take for example.

Wahiduddin Khan
When those who deny the truth hear the admonition, they would almost cause you to stumble with their evil eyes; and they say, He is certainly mad

Musharraf Hussain
They wish to strike you down with their evil eyes; when the disbelievers hear the Reminder they say, "He is mad!"
https://www.islamawakened.com/quran/68/51/#gsc.tab=0

I do want to make another slight note that *Ibn kathir* who is the most authoritative and most renowned scholar for Qur'anic exegesis points out that this passage is a clear proof for the *Evil Eye,* so it even seems that later Muslims were quite familiar with the curse and it's involvement within Islam.
Ibn `Abbas, Mujahid and others have said, لَيُزْلِقُونَكَ
(would make you slip)
"In order to have some effect on you." بِأَبْصَـرِهِمْ (with their eyes)
meaning, `they will affect you by looking at you with their eyes (i.e., the evil eye).'
This means `they are jealous of you due to their hatred of you, and were it not for Allah's protection of you, defending you against them (then their evil eye would harm you).
'The Effect of the Evil Eye is Real
In this Ayah is a proof that the effect of the evil eye and its affliction by the command of Allah is real.
https://quran.com/68:51/tafsirs/en-tafisr-ibn-kathir

I do want to point out that the explanation behind the Evil Eye that Ibn Kathir gives is too similar to Greek/Roman myths. As he prescribes the curse to be a result of a gaze of *envy or jealousy* which is most damning because of the weight behind such a proclamation of belief, as this superstition was taken in its most literal sense in the Qur'an and as i will demonstrate later even made its way into hadith's, prescribing even modern Muslims to believe in such paganism. Take for example the hadith that is on the authority of Ibn abbas,

Ibn 'Abbas reported Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) as saying:
The influence of an evil eye is a fact; if anything would precede the destiny it would be the influence of an evil eye, and when you are asked to take bath (as a cure) from the influence of an evil eye, you should take bath.
https://sunnah.com/muslim:2188

Here it seems that Mohammad has prescribed that washing oneself is a *"cure"* for the influence of the Evil Eye, and that Mohammad has implied that the influence of the curse was a real thing. Another striking hadith is where Muslims seem to be so worried of this influence and of it's harm that they start entertaining the idea that the Evil Eye should be treated as an illness and they should be performing *"ruqyah"* for the *influence* which is the prescribed practice of treating illnesses through Qur'ānic recitations.

It was narrated that 'Ubaid bin Rifa'ah Az-Zuraqi said:"Asma' said: 'O Messenger of Allah! The children of Ja'far have been afflicted by the evil eye, shall I recite Ruqyah* for them?' He said: 'Yes, for if anything were to overtake the Divine decree it would be the evil eye.'"
https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:3510
Here it seems to imply that other children of the ancient Islamic world were influenced by the curse just as Mohammad had been when he was a child. On that note I would like to point out that Aminah was not the only one using "spells"

for curing the curse as aforementioned. But sources suggest that the entire early Muslim world was some sort of sorcerous community using and casting spells and enchantments for make-believe curses, prime examples would be found in these hadith's.

Narrated Imran ibn Husayn:The Prophet (ﷺ) said:
No spell is to be used except for the evil eye or a scorpion sting.
https://www.islamicity.org/hadith/search/index.php?q=24174&sss=1

A'isha reported that a Jew from among the Jews of Banu Zuraiq who was called Labid b. al-A'sam cast spell upon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) with the result that he (under the influence of the spell) felt that he had been doing something whereas in fact he had not been doing that. (This state of affairs lasted) until one day or during one night Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) made supplication (to dispel its effects). He again made a supplication and he again did this and said to 'A'isha: Do you know that Allah has told me what I had asked Him? There came to me two men and one amongst them sat near my head and the other one near my feet and he who sat near my head said to one who sat near my feet or one who sat near my feet said to one who sat near my head: What is the trouble with the man? He said: The spell has affected him. He said: Who has cast that? He (the other one) said: It was Labid b. A'sam (who has done it). He said: What is the thing by which he transmitted its effect? He said: By the comb and by the hair stuck to the comb and the spathe of the date-palm. He said: Where is tbap He replied: In the well of Dhi Arwan. She said : Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) sent some of the persons from among his Companions there and then said: 'A'isha. by Allah, its water was yellow like henna and its trees were like heads of the devils. She said that she asked Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as to why he did not burn that. He said: No, Allah has cured me and I do not like that I should induce people to commit any high-handedness in regard (to one another), but I only commanded that it should be buried.
Book 26, Number 5428:
http://www.sabawoon.com/Library/hadith/muslim/026_smt.html

A Muslim might attempt to say that these spells are merely just Qur'anic recitation or prayers but such claims would be put to halt when you consider the aforementioned quote, where Aminah herself used these *"spells"* to rid Mohammad of the influence, when he was a child when there were no Qur'anic verses to recite from, due to the fact Mohammad was a child and Islam was not yet a thing.

'Ali Halabi, in his Turkish work entitled Insanu'l Uyun, informs us that many people declared that Aminah, Muhammad's mother, used a spell in order to recover him from the influence of the evil eye.

On that note, it is time to establish a conclusion. As numerous quotations have been presented, but their collective significance has yet to exemplify the influence that this superstition had, I myself attribute it to a cancer that grew undetected until it was so thoroughly integrated into the religion that its foreign nature was no longer recognized, as if the superstition that surrounded Mohammad's world prior to his revelations successfully infested itself into Islam like a parasite treated as divine revelation, despite it's pagan origin. Id say there is no means to pretend that there is not a reality within Islam borrowing from pre-Islamic pagan practices that flourished around Mohammad's birth place. As Muhammad was born in Mecca a well-documented commercial and religious trading hub where many pagan cultures, beliefs, and superstitions converged. One of the biggest practices that integrated into Islam from the pagan environment of Mecca was the Kaaba itself. Mohammad personally *"conquered"* the structure into the Islamic religion making claims that it was built by none other then *Abraham* and his son *Ishmael*.

And ˹remember˺ when Abraham raised the foundation of the House with Ishmael, ˹both praying,˺ "Our Lord! Accept ˹this˺ from us. You are indeed the All-Hearing, All-Knowing.
2:127

In reality The Kaaba itself, prior to Islam, functioned as a pagan sanctuary housing no less then three-hundred and sixty idols that Mohammad himself destroyed.
The Prophet (ﷺ) entered Mecca and (at that time) there were three hundred-and-sixty idols around the Ka`ba. He started stabbing the idols with a stick he had in his hand and reciting: "Truth (Islam) has come and Falsehood (disbelief) has vanished."
https://sunnah.com/bukhari:2478

It did not only function as a pagan sanctuary but also served as a hub for trade which also competed with other trade sites that had similar structures take for example the aforementioned,
"house of dhul khalasa / Yemenite Kaba"
Jarir bin 'Abdullah narrated:
There was a house called Dhul-Khalasa in the Pre-Islamic Period and it was also called Al-Ka'ba Al-Yamaniya or Al-Ka'ba Ash-Shamiya. Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said to me, "Will you relieve me from Dhul-Khalasa?" So I left for it with 150 cavalrymen from the tribe of Ahmas and then we destroyed it and killed whoever we found there. Then we came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and informed him about it. He invoked good upon us and upon the tribe of Ahmas.

The Dhul-Khalasa was not alone, as many historians point out that *Najran*, a significant region in southern Arabia where diverse cultures, including a substantial Christian community with various sects,

had converged, had a Kaʿba of their very own. Famously mentioned in the *book of idols (Kitab Al-Asnam)* by *Hisham Ibn Al-Kalbi*

The Kaʿbah of Najran

The Banū al-Ḥārith ibn Kaʿb had in Najrān a Kaʿba which they venerated.

https://www.bible.ca/islam/library/Al-Kalbi/najran.htm

It is also true that these structures served the purpose for idol worship directed to pagan deities, and it is also true that building houses for these deities was a common practice, take for example the fact that the Qur'an makes mention of two idols called *Lât and 'Uzza,*

Now, have you considered ˹the idols of˺ Lât and 'Uzza,

(Quran 53:19)

these two idols had their very own Kaaba's as *ibn kathir* makes this point abundantly clear in his tafsir

Refuting Idolatry, Al-Lat and Al-ʿUzza

Allah the Exalted rebukes the idolators for worshipping idols and taking rivals to Him. They built houses for their idols to resemble the Kaʿbah

(Have you then considered Al-Lat,) Al-Lat was a white stone with inscriptions on. There was a house built around Al-Lat in At-Taʿif with curtains, servants and a sacred courtyard around it. The people of At-Taʿif, the tribe of Thaqif and their allies, worshipped Al-Lat.

https://quran.com/53:19/tafsirs/en-tafisr-ibn-kathir

Then you have the *Kabah* of Sindad

The Iyid[1] had another Kaʿbah in Sindad[2], [located] in a region between al-Kufah[3] and al-Basrah[4].

https://www.bible.ca/islam/library/Al-Kalbi/sindad.htm

These structures served the same purpose as the Meccan Kaaba, as I already established that Mecca's structure had three-hundred and sixty idols within it prior to Mohammad destroying them. This establishes that the Kaaba in Mecca was one among many local sanctuaries, not unique or special in any way shape or form, and was only re-branded by Mohammad to be some sort of ancient building built by Abraham and his son Ishmael. Without any pre-Islamic evidence to support the claim. The evidence shows quite the contrary, realistically the Kaaba was a pre-Islamic pagan sanctuary, pilgrimage site, and not unique in any way as it was one of many cubical shrines (ka'bas) scattered across Arabia. There's no evidence in my mind to support that there was anything exceptional or extraordinary about the Kaaba in Mecca. However it was more successful then it's adjacent *neighbours* but that is only because Mohammad had *conquered* and re-branded the structure, destroying it's relatives, thus erasing them out of history. The Kaaba had been a primary religious structure for Islam despite it's foreign pagan background and was adapted directly into Mohammad's religion. Some of the ceremonial practises that predated Islam that specifically revolved around the Kaaba had even made their way into the religion. Pre-Islamic Arabs had already performed *ṭawāf* around the Kaaba and other ka'bas as a standard pagan tradition. Even Muslims themselves were quite skeptical of the idea. As they were well acquainted with the Pagan concept of circling cubic structures.

"Narrated `Asim:I asked Anas bin Malik:
"Did you use to dislike to perform Tawaf between Safa and Marwa?" He said, "Yes, as it was of the ceremonies of the days of the Pre-Islamic period of ignorance, till Allah revealed: 'Verily! (The two mountains) As-Safa and Al-Marwa are among the symbols of Allah. It is therefore no sin for him who performs the pilgrimage to the Ka`ba, or performs `Umra, to perform Tawaf between them.'"
https://sunnah.com/bukhari:1648

Tawaf was not the only ceremony that Islam took from its pre-Islamic pagan predecessors as *Kiswa* was also taken from pagan roots. The practice of covering important or holy buildings or structures with cloth, sheets or curtains is not even unique to the Middle East. But to shorten this chapter I will specifically only focus on the influence such a practice had within pre-Islamic Arabian cultures.

The History of the Kiswa Tradition

Pre-Islamic Period

The tradition of covering the Ka'ba with a kiswa dates back to the pre-Islamic period, known as the Jahiliyya era, and developed as an expression of respect for the Ka'ba. – (Wensinck 1977, vol. 6, pp. 9–14) According to tradition, the covering of the Ka'ba existed even before Islam, although it is not known exactly who first initiated it.

file:///C:/Users/dripp/Downloads/religions-16-00358-v2.pdf

I'd assert that it was quite inevitable that the practice of *kiswa* was going to be developed within Islam. Since the practice of covering cubic structures that were venerated was involved with Mohammad's very own tribe. The *Quraysh* themselves covered the Kaaba in Mecca when it housed numerous idols A clear account of this tribal involvement appears in a detailed historical overview from *Al Anbaa* which is a Kuwaiti daily newspaper, that was published on November *28, 2014* in an article titled,

("Between Beauty, Dignity, and Majesty.. The Story of the Kaaba Covering")

"Moreover, the Quraysh in pre-Islamic times covered the Kaaba

/

The Arabs in pre-Islamic times covered it with veils (skins), and from the time of the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, the Kaaba was covered with Yemeni clothes, and during the era of Omar and Othman, may God be pleased with them, the Copts from Egypt covered it (Special fabric)."

https://www.alanba.com.kw/ar/kuwait-news/islamic-faith/516703/28-11-2014-/قصة-كسوة-الكعبة

This should not surprise anyone, Mohammad was not shy to adopt the pagan centre of his birth place *(the Kaaba)* into his religion. So why not adopt the pagan rituals that surrounded and revolved around it. I mentioned before that Mohammad *conquered* the structure and I do want to point out that I was not just using militaristic language for fun, Mohammad really did conquer the structure. Take for instance the fact that Mohammad after preaching for nearly thirteen years had left Mecca after the Muslims were being severely persecuted by the Quraysh tribe *(his own people)* including assassination attempts. He then migrated to Medina where he built up the Muslim community and even fought many battles *(Badr, Uhud,)* after these several years, the Prophet returned to Mecca. And one could potentially say that this was a decisive military campaign since Muhammad marched ten thousand men back to Mecca and upon arrival there was minimal resistance most Quraysh surrendered or fled after years of broken treaties. The prophet then ordered the destruction of the idols within the respected site of his tribe and then dedicated the structure to worship Allah alone. Yet he preserved some of the elements of the pre-Islamic pagan traditions such as *kiswa* and *tawaf* to be kept in practice.

I would like to classify these assertions under the correct classification as it would be important to do so. I guess moving forward I can refer to such preservations of such pagan concepts as *selective adoption*. I'd hope it is not surprising to anyone that even the *black stone* is a prime example of this selective adaptation. And was revered in pre-Islamic Arabia as a sacred object within the pagan shrine as it was already part of the Kaaba long before Islam a prime example would be in the first ever biography of the prophet written by *Ibn Ishaq.*

Layth b. Abū Sulaym alleged that they found a stone in the Ka'ba forty years before the prophet's mission,
/

The tribes of Quraysh gathered stones for the building, each tribe collecting them and building by itself until the building was finished up to the black stone, where controversy arose, each tribe wanting to lift it to its place, until they went their several ways, formed alliances, and got ready for battle.
https://archive.org/details/TheLifeOfMohammedGuillaume/page/n65/mode/2up?q=black+stone

The events described by *Ibn Ishaq* in his biography of the Prophet, gives us clear accounts on how the inscribed stone was reportedly found in the Kaaba forty years before the Prophet's mission began *(around 570 CE)*, near the time of his birth. On that note I do see it fit to make mention on the numerous accounts of how the Kaaba had gone through major reconstruction done by the Quraysh tribes (Mohammad's own people.) including on how he gives account of the fierce dispute over who should be placing the Black Stone onto the structure. This pre-Islamic reverence for the Black Stone continued into Islam, where the Prophet preserved it during the Conquest of Mecca. This should at this point not surprise anyone as nothing adjacent to the Kaaba or the black stone is original. But it is worth noting that the practice of *Istilām* which is the ritual act during the Islamic pilgrimage (Hajj) of touching, kissing, or gesturing towards the Black Stone is also deeply rooted within Islam's pagan predecessor. Even the Islamic historian and commentator *Al-Azraqī* makes note on how even the pagans would perform the practice of embracing and touching/kissing stones.

"Al-Azraqī (ibid., 190), for example, describes the pre-Islamic inhabitants of Mecca stroking two stone idols – named Isāf and Nāʾila – situated near the Kaʿba. Worshippers in Mecca would reportedly perform istilām – the same word used for the ritual of touching and kissing the Black Stone – at these two idols to mark the beginning and end of their circumambulation of the Kaʿba (cf. Qummī Citation2014, vol. 1, 98)."
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17458927.2021.2020604#d1e213

This is precisely why Mohammad's very own companions were skeptical of performing *Istilām* to the black stone. Take for example a striking hadith that quotes a companion in saying that if he had not seen Mohammad performing the practice he himself would not have done it.
Narrated `Abis bin Rabi`a:`
Umar came near the Black Stone and kissed it and said "No doubt, I know that you are a stone and can neither benefit anyone nor harm anyone. Had I not seen Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) kissing you I would not have kissed you."
https://sunnah.com/bukhari:1597

The fact that the companion points out the black stone was merely just a stone and can not harm nor benefit anyone shows that he was conscious of the idea that this was done to perform acts of veneration or respect to pagan deities/stones. He then declares that if he had not seen the Prophet performing *Istilām* then he would not have done it himself. Everything to do with the Kaaba is unoriginal, Everything to do with the black stone is unoriginal, the Sunnah of the prophet is littered with pagan fetishes take for example that the Qur'an never once mentions the black stone, kiswa, or Istilam. All we have is the companions being skeptical with their relationship to *Jahiliyyah (Age of Ignorance)* yet they went through the process of *selective adoption.*

All the aforementioned practices from pre-Islamic paganism that revolved around the Kaaba and the black stone are still observed and kept in every *Hajj*. Proving that all of these practices that Mohammad adopted selectively are deeply rooted and sourced within Meccas polytheistic religions.

I would like to move on from the persistence of pre-Islamic pagan rituals that are still observed within the Islamic religion, and turn instead to the stories that predated Islam and are treated as divine fact. As I did touch on some of the compelling evidence that the Qur'an already borrows directly from human forged stories of Jesus Christ from the infancy Gospels earlier in this chapter. So it would be fitting that I make mention on other stories and legends that Mohammad borrowed from that are within the Qur'an, being treated as divine revelation from his God. On that note I do hope it is not a surprise to anyone that the Qur'anic story of Dhu al-Qarnayn is nothing more then borrowed legend and is not original to Islam whatsoever. It comes directly from Syriac Christian/Jewish legends that predated Islam for centuries. This is not surprising in the slightest as the Qur'an already borrows from Syriac Christian's quite a lot, *Injil* is directly taken from the Syriac form of the Greek *evangelion* used by Christians before Islam was a thing. Even the word for Messiah in Arabic (al-Masīḥ/the Messiah) is taken directly from the Syriac word *mšīḥā.* Numerous other instances can be found as the Qur'an is not a pure Arabic book as it takes words from the Hebrew/Syriac/Aramaic languages often. But for this case only the influence of the Syriac language will be addressed in this portion of the chapter. Christians often times used the Syriac language whilst speaking with Arabs even before Islam was a thing. As it is essential for my case and provides the most direct response for the narrative of Dhu al-Qarnayn. To start off it is important that the reader is equipped with the understanding for the reason this figure is even mentioned in the Qur'an in the first place, Mohammad was merely challenged by a group of poets that were sent by the Jews of Medina to ask Mohammad questions.

one of these questions revolved around the figure (Dhu al-Qarnayn)
From the seerah of the story of Dhulqarnain in Surah Al Kahf, we know that the story arose because the Quraish led by An-Nadr bin Harith went to see the Jewish Rabbis of Madinah about the prophethood of Muhammad SAW and the rabbis gave An Nadr three questions to asks Rasulullah.
https://www.imamghazali.org/blog/tafsir-surah-al-kahf-verses-83-101-dhul-qarnayn

An-Nadr bin Harith is only strengthening our case as tafsirs from ibn kathir plainly state that he went to Persia, where the myth had been flourishing for decades prior to Islam being a thing. And whilst he visited he learned several stories, some being of heroic kings. I do not think people need reminding that Alexander the great had conquered Persia and in doing so he had self proclaimed to be the of king of Persia.
An-Nadr visited Persia and learned the stories of some Persian kings, such as Rustum and Isphandiyar. When he went back to Makkah, He found that the Prophet was sent from Allah and reciting the Qur'an to the people. Whenever the Prophet would leave an audience in which An-Nadr was sitting, An-Nadr began narrating to them the stories that he learned in Persia,
https://quran.com/8:31/tafsirs/en-tafisr-ibn-kathir

Al-Naḍr's exposure to Persian storytelling therefore gives us a unique figure who is somewhat a credentialed expert. As he was within the same late antique legendary environment from which the Qurʾānic account of Dhū al-Qarnayn emerges. And the Qur'an is quite clear on how Al-Nadr was familiar with the story that Mohammad gave him of Dhu al-Qarnayn saying Mohammad was presenting fables from ancient times.
Whenever Our revelations are recited to them, they challenge ˹you˺, "We have already heard ˹the recitation˺. If we wanted, we could have easily produced something similar. This ˹Quran˺ is nothing but ancient fables!"
(Qur'an 8:31)

Whenever the Prophet would leave an audience in which An-Nadr was sitting, An-Nadr began narrating to them the stories that he learned in Persia,...
The meaning of, أَسَـٰطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ ..tales of the ancients) meaning that the Prophet has plagiarized and learned books of ancient people,
https://quran.com/8:31/tafsirs/en-tafisr-ibn-kathir

These facts indicate that al-Naḍr b. al-Ḥārith was entirely unimpressed by Muhammad's response to the challenge and did not regard it as a successful vindication of his prophetic claims. Having been exposed to mythic and legendary narratives within the Persian cultural environment that surrounded around the Alexander mythos.
Having addressed the background and historical context of this narrative, it is now appropriate to turn to the specific parallels within the Syriac Legend of Alexander the Great upon being asked by An-Nadr on who Dhu al-Qarnayn was the Qur'an gives Mohammads response saying
And they ask you about Dhul-qarnain say i will recite to you a rememberance
Quran 18:83

This verse is extremely important because of the interpretations that authoritative Muslim tafsir writers give. Many Muslim's might assert that Dhu al-Qarnan is not even about Alexander the great. Such claims however would be put to halt once the authoritative interpretations are addressed, take for instance Jalal - Al-Jalalayn which is considered a highly authoritative and essential classical Sunni commentary.
The commentary explicitly attributes Dhu al-Qarnayn to being a type for Alexander the great.
Jalal - Al-Jalalayn
And they, the Jews, question you concerning Dhū'l-Qarnayn, whose name was Alexander; he was not a prophet. Say: 'I shall recite, relate, to you a mention, an account, of him', of his affair.
https://quranx.com/tafsirs/18.83

This is not surprising and is particularly damaging to claims of originality, since no historical sources concerning Alexander the Great contain these episodes. Rather, they appear exclusively within legendary mythological traditions, most notably those preserved in the Syriac Alexander Romance as i will start gradually demonstrating it's influence within the Qur'an. Starting off we have several parallels within Qur'an 18:85-86 where the Qur'an seems to be vague in detail but gets perfectly explained when we harmonize it with it's Syriac predecessor.

So he travelled a course, until he reached the setting ˹point˺ of the sun, which appeared to him to be setting in a spring of murky water, where he found some people. We said, "O Ẓul-Qarnain! Either punish them or treat them kindly.

Surah Al-Kahf - 85-86

now compare this with *(The History of Alexander the Great, being the Syriac version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes)* where the legend goes over the exact event in grave detail to the point it goes in depth on his travelling a "course" until he reached a water where the sun sets into where it then gives an in depth account on what the Qur'an is referring to when it says *"either punish them or treat them kindly".*

Now this I desire to go and see, upon what the heavens rest, and what surrounds all creation." The nobles answered and said to the king, "Bid us speak ;" and he commanded them, and they spake and said to him; "As to the thing, my lord, which thy majesty (or thy greatness) desires to go and see, namely, upon what the heavens rest, and what surrounds the earth, the terrible seas which surround the world will not give thee a passage *; because there are eleven bright seas, on which the ships of men sail, and beyond these there is about ten miles of dry land, and beyond these ten miles there is the fcetid sea, Okéyands (the Ocean), which surrounds all creation. Men are not able to come near to this foetid sea, neither can ships sail thereon,

and no bird is able to fly over it, for if a bird should attempt to fly over it, it is caught and falls and is suffocated therein'. Its waters are like pus; and if men swim therein, they die at once...
And they put ships to sea and sailed on the sea four months' and twelve days, and they arrived at the dry land beyond the eleven bright seas. And Alexander and his troops encamped, and he sent and called to him the governor who was in the camp, and said to him, "Are there any men here guilty of death?" They said to him, "We have thirty and seven men in bonds who are guilty of death." And the king said to the governor, " Bring hither those evil doers." And they brought them, and the king commanded them and said, "Go ye to the shore of the foetid sea,... And the men went, and came to the shore of the sea. Now Alexander thought within himself, "If it be true as they say, that everyone who comes near the foetid sea dies, it is better that these who are guilty of death should die," and when they had gone, and had arrived at the shore of the sea, they died instantly. And Alexander and his troops were looking at them when they died, for he and his nobles had ridden to see what would happen to them, and they saw that they died the moment that they reached the sea...
So the whole camp mounted, and Alexander and his troops went up between the foetid sea and the bright sea to the place where the sun enters the window of heaven ; for the sun is the servant of the Lord, and neither by night nor by day does he cease from his travelling.
Pages 145-148
https://archive.org/details/BudgeSyriacAlexander/page/145/mode/2up?q=land

In the legend that predated Islam we see that Alexander the great had a journey to the place of the setting of the sun where he saw the fetid sea which it set in.

It then gives an account of how rumours circulated on how it is thought that if people were to go near the body of water they themselves would be killed. Which then Alexander orders that *evildoers/prisoners* condemned with the death penalty should walk to the water to test the myth which then results with the men being killed. These events is precisely what the Qur'an touches on when it makes mention of, ***Either punish them or treat them kindly.*** The Qur'an goes on to say, ***He responded, "Whoever does wrong will be punished by us, then will be returned to their Lord, Who will punish them with a horrible torment. As for those who believe and do good, they will have the finest reward, and we will assign them easy commands." Then he travelled a ˹different˺ course until he reached the rising ˹point˺ of the sun. He found it rising on a people for whom We had provided no shelter from it.***

Qur'an 18:87-90

Notice the parallel in both accounts on how Alexander would find the rising place of the sun, the parallel is clearly demonstrated within the aforementioned quotes. These instances are perfect examples for evidence of influence.

So the whole camp mounted, and Alexander and his troops went up between the foetid sea and the bright sea to the place where the sun enters the window of heaven ; for the sun is the servant of the Lord, and neither by night nor by day does he cease from his travelling.

The History of Alexander the Great, being the Syriac version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes

/

Then he travelled a ˹different˺ course until he reached the rising ˹point˺ of the sun. He found it rising on a people for whom We had provided no shelter from it.

Qur'an 18:90

The Qur'an talks about a people who live within the region of the rising sun who had no shelter from presumably the heat although it is incredibly vague on why it is bad they do not have a shelter from the sun. Of course this vagueness again gets explained in depth within the mythos of Alexander the great. In *page 148*

to the place where the sun enters the window of heaven ; for the sun is the servant of the Lord, and neither by night nor by day does he cease from his travelling. The place of his rising is over the sea, and the people who dwell there, when he is about to rise, flee away and hide themselves in the sea, that they be not burnt by his rays;...

and wherever he passes there are terrible mountains, and those who dwell there have caves hollowed out in the rocks, and as soon as they see the sun passing [over them], men and birds flee away from before him and hide in the caves,

fur rocks are rent by his blazing heat and fall down, and whether they be men or beasts, as soon as the stones touch them they are consumed. And when the sun enters the window of heaven, he straightway bows down and makes obeisance before God his Creator; and he travels and descends the whole night through the heavens, until at length he finds himself where he rises.

One who has read the contents of Qur'an 18:90 and the verses leading up to it that give it context, will see the striking similarities that it has as the mythos seems to be giving the Qur'an extreme detail and harmonizes the material together quite fittingly, like Cinderella's shoe or it fitting like a glove, whatever one may equivocate it to it is not overlooked within this chapter and shows compelling evidence for influence. Next up we have the fact that the Qur'an almost word for word borrows from the story of the wall that Alexander the great builds to protect a people from *"gog and magog"* and it is also worth noting that the Qur'an doesnt seem to hold back in any way shape or form not only preserving the story as divine revelation but also treats the story as some sort of eschatological prophecy.

Then he travelled a ˹third˺ course until he reached ˹a pass˺ between two mountains. He found in front of them a people who could hardly understand ˹his˺ language. They pleaded, "O Ẓul-Qarnain! Surely Gog and Magog are spreading corruption throughout the land. Should we pay you tribute, provided that you build a wall between us and them?" He responded, "What my Lord has provided for me is far better. But assist me with resources,

and I will build a barrier between you and them. Bring me blocks of iron!" Then, when he had filled up ˹the gap˺ between the two mountains, he ordered, "Blow!" When the iron became red hot, he said, "Bring me molten copper to pour over it." And so the enemies could neither scale nor tunnel through it. He declared, "This is a mercy from my Lord. But when the promise of my Lord comes to pass, He will level it to the ground. And my Lord's promise is ever true." On that Day, We will let them surge ˹like waves˺ over one another. Later, the Trumpet will be blown, and We will gather all ˹people˺ together. On that Day We will display Hell clearly for the disbelievers,
Qur'an 18:92-100

The mythos of Alexander the great goes over these exact events portraying that a people want a wall that will separate them from a people who are violent and are even led by figures named *gog and magog* and even portrays a wall being made from brass and iron that can neither be dug under nor crossed over that is built between two mountains.

Yea, by your majesty, my lord the king, neither we nor our fathers have been able to march one step in it, and men do not ascend it either on that side or on this, for it is the boundary which God has set between us and the nations within it.' Alexander said, "Who are the nations within this mountain upon which we are looking?....." The natives of the land said, "They are the Huns." He said to them, " Who are their kings?" The old men said: "Gog* and Magog.....

When Alexander had heard what the old men said, he marvelled greatly at the great sea which surrounded all creation; and Alexander said to his troops, "Do ye desire that we should do something wonderful in this land?" They said to him, " As thy majesty commands we will do." The king said, " Let us make a gate of brass and close up this breach." His troops said, " As thy majesty commands we will do." And Alexander commanded and fetched three thousand smiths, workers in iron, and three thousand men, workers in brass) And they put down brass and iron, and kneaded it as a man kneads when he works clay. Then they brought it and made a gate, the length of which was twelve cubits and its breadth eight cubits'. And he made a lower threshold from mountain to mountain, the length of which was twelve cubits; and he hammered it into the rocks of the mountains, and it was fixed in with brass and iron. The height of the lower threshold was three cubits. And he made an upper threshold from mountain to mountain, twelve cubits in length; and he hammered it into the rocks of the mountain, and fixed in it two bolts of iron, each bolt being twelve cubits [long]; and the bolts went into the rock two cubits; and he made two bolts of iron from rock to rock behind the gate, and fixed the heads of the bolts into the rocks. He fixed the gate and the bolts, and he placed nails of iron and beat them down one by the other, so that if the Huns came and dug out the rock which was under the threshold of iron, even if footmen were able to pass through, a horse with its rider would be unable to pass, so long as the gate that was hammered down with bolts stood.

Pages 150-154

The significance of this parallel cannot be overstated. None of these elements, the mountain pass, the fear of Gog and Magog, the construction of a barrier between two mountains, or the use of iron and molten metal to create a structure that can neither be scaled nor tunneled appear in any historical account of Alexander the Great. Instead, these accounts belong exclusively to the mythological Alexander tradition that has been preserved in antique literature. The Qurʾānic account of Dhū al-Qarnayn does not originate with Islamic material. This would establish the indication that the Qurʾān was drawing directly from an established legendary tradition that was quite known in various regions that surrounded Mohammad. One of the most defining Qur'an verse for this parallel that i will use to conclude the citing of parallels. Is qur'an 18:84 where we are told in Allah's perspective that He will establish Alexander power on earth.

Yusuf Ali

Verily We established his power on earth, and We gave him the ways and the means to all ends.

Then we have in the History of Alexander the great in the Syriac version declaring this very thing but in the perspective of Alexander asking for power.

give me power from thy holy heavens that I may receive strength greater than [that of] the kingdoms of the world and that I may humble them, and I will magnify thy name, O Lord, for ever
Page 146

In both accounts, Alexander's global dominion is not portrayed as the result of military genius alone, but as a power granted to him by the divine. This convergence confirms that the Qurʾānic narrative participates in the same late antique theological mythos that shaped the Syriac Alexander tradition, rather than independent historical memory or divine revelation.

Having examined the Qur'anic account of Dhū al-Qarnayn in light of the Syriac Alexander Romance, it becomes clear that the narrative is deeply rooted in a pre-Islamic legendary and theological myths that were well developed prior to Islam in the regions that the religion flourished. With this understanding of Alexander's mythic framework established, we can now turn to another story from Surah Al-Kahf (Chapter 18) which is the same chapter that we covered for the mythos of Alexander the great. The narrative of the Seven Sleepers is also deeply rooted within Christian legends just like the story of Alexander the great. There are a great number of clear parallels between the Qur'anic story of the seven sleepers and the legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. Which is concerning as it was treated as myth or legend prior to Islam, which makes sense since it predates Islam by centuries. Both stories start with the narrative of seven youths being in trouble, while the Qur'an seems to be quite vague about the nature of their specific problems. In contrast the story of the seven sleepers of Ephesus just like the aforementioned Alexander the great mythos delves deeply on the concepts that get vaguely touched on in the Qur'an. So much so that when harmonized with it's predecessor we develop an explanation to what the Qur'an is even referring to. Starting off we have in verse ten of chapter eighteen

Behold, the youths betook themselves to the Cave: they said, "Our Lord! bestow on us Mercy from Thyself, and dispose of our affair for us in the right way!"

Quran 18:10

However the seven sleepers of Ephesus gives great detail of why they took shelter within the cave, the legend tells specifically of an emperor, named Decius, who was forcing Christians to make sacrifices to the pagan gods or else face death.

The seven sleepers were born in the city of Ephesus. And when Decius the emperor came into Ephesus for the persecution of christian men, he commanded to edify the temples in the middle of the city,

so that all should come with him to do sacrifice to the idols, and did do seek all the christian people, and bind them for to make them to do sacrifice, or else to put them to death

https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fordham.edu%2Fhalsall%2Fbasis%2Fgoldenlegend%2FGoldenLegend-Volume4.asp&date=2013-12-04

Another striking yet funny parallel is the fact that some versions of the early Syriac retelling of the seven sleepers of Ephesus there is some dispute about the time the sleepers were in the cave. Apparently, it seems that this disagreement was an issue to Allah as well. The Qur'an declares that Allah has woken the sleepers as a way to test who could calculate the length of their stay the best.

Shakir:

Then We raised them up that We might know which of the two parties was best able to compute the time for which they remained.

Quran 18:11

/

It is in doubt of that which is said that they slept three hundred and sixty-two years, for they were raised the year of our Lord four hundred and seventy-eight, and Decius reigned but one year and three months, and that was in the year of our Lord two hundred and seventy, and so they slept but two hundred and eight years.

In the Qur'anic account, the text asks whether the reader has reflected on the Companions of the Cave and their inscription. The inclusion of the word "inscription" is an important detail connecting the story of the Qur'an with the story of the Seven Sleepers. Because in the Syriac legend, we have a more detailed narrative that states that the story of the youth's martyrdom was written and laid near the entrance of the cave.

Or have you thought that the companions of the cave and the inscription were, among Our signs, a wonder?

Quran 18:9

/

Then Decius thought what he should do with them, and, as our Lord would, he enclosed the mouth of the cave wherein they were with stones, to the end that they should die therein for hunger and fault of meat. Then the ministers and two christian men, Theodorus and Rufinus, wrote their martyrdom and laid it subtlely among the stones.

While the Qur'an does not mention the inscription again, it plays an important role in the Syriac story. The people who discover the sleepers use the inscriptions to verify the truthfulness of the seven men's story. This helps make sense of why the author of the Qur'an would mention this detail as part of what the reader should "reflect" upon.

And Malchus entered first into the cave to his fellows, and the bishop next after him. And there found they among the stones the letters sealed with two seals of silver. And then the bishop called them that were come thither, and read them tofore them all, so that they that heard it were all abashed and amarvelled.

We also have Ibn Kathir's classic tafsir. Ibn Kathir quotes Sa'id bin Jubayr in saying that the "ar-Raqim" was indeed an inscription placed at the entrance of the cave. This confirms the direct connection to the Syriac legend.

With regard to the word Ar-Raqim, Al-`Awfi reported from Ibn `Abbas that it is a valley near Aylah. This was also said in another narration by Atiyah Al-Awfi and Qatadah. Ad-Dahhak said: "As for Al-Kahf, it is a cave in the valley, and Ar-Raqim is the name of the valley." Mujahid said, "Ar-Raqim refers to their buildings." Others said it refers to the valley in which their cave was. Abdur-Razzaq recorded that Ibn Abbas said about Ar-Raqim: "Ka`b used to say that it was the town." Ibn Jurayj reported that Ibn Abbas said, "Ar-Raqim is the mountain in which the cave was."

Sa'id bin Jubayr said, "Ar-Raqim is a tablet of stone on which they wrote the story of the people of the Cave, then they placed it at the entrance to the Cave."

https://quran.com/al-kahf/12/tafsirs

In both accounts the young men sleep in the cave for hundreds of years, they think they have only slept just a day.
Pickthall
And in like manner We awakened them that they might question one another. A speaker from among them said: How long have ye tarried? They said: We have tarried a day or some part of a day, (Others) said: Your Lord best knoweth what ye have tarried.
Quran 18:19

/
And then these holy saints, that were within, awoke and were raised and intersalued each other, and had supposed verily that they had slept but one night only, and remembered of the heaviness that they had the day tofore.

Another parallel would be in the fact that Both accounts state that the youths slept for hundreds of years. The Qur'an stating that it was 300 years and the Syriac version stating the number was closer to 200. There is considerable variation in different versions of the Seven Sleeper legend as to the time frame that they slept. Though all of them are longer than 200 years.
So they stayed in their Cave three hundred years, and (some) add nine (more).Quran
18:25
/
... and so they slept but two hundred and eight years.

There are several other parallels within Qur'an chapter eighteen but to shorten this chapter i will recite one last parallel before giving an ultimate conclusion. At that both the Syriac legend and the Qur'anic story state that the youth were awoken as a way to strengthen the faith of believers in the final Day of Judgement.

Thus did We make their case known to the people, that they might know that the promise of Allah is true, and that there can be no doubt about the Hour of Judgment. ..."

Quran 18:21

/

And as soon as the blessed saints of our Lord saw the emperor come, their visages shone like to the sun. And the emperor entered then, and glorified our Lord and embraced them, weeping upon each of them, and said: I see you now like as I should see our Lord raising Lazarus. And then Maximian said to him: Believe us, for forsooth our Lord hath raised us tofore the day of the great resurrection. And to the end that thou believe firmly the resurrection of the dead people, verily we be raised as ye here see, and live.

https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fordham.edu%2Fhalsall%2Fbasis%2Fgoldenlegend%2FGoldenLegend-Volume4.asp&date=2013-12-04

Having examined the Qur'anic account of both Dhu al-Qarnayn and the seven sleepers, there is no doubt in my mind that these concepts were deeply rooted within the pre-Islamic legendary and theological myths that were well developed prior to Islam in the regions where the religion flourished. This would conclude that Chapter Eighteen of the Qur'an is completely infested and littered with late antique Christian legend. Particularly from Syriac traditions, in fact these verses were treated in the same manner as i am portraying them now. The qur'an makes it clear that Mohammad's bystanders were highly critical of where he was getting these stories from in the first place take for instance the numerous accounts of when the qur'an had to deflect from such claims take, for instance, the following verses, (6:25) (8:31) (16:24) (25:5) (23:83) (27:68) (46:17) (68:15) (83:13).

There are some of them who ⌜pretend to⌝ listen to ɣour recitation ⌜of the Quran⌝, but We have cast veils over their hearts—leaving them unable to comprehend it—and deafness in their ears. Even if theɣ were to see everɣ sign, theɣ still would not believe in them. The disbelievers would ⌜even⌝ come to argue with ɣou, saɣing, "This ⌜Quran⌝ is nothing but ancient fables!"
(6:25)

Whenever Our revelations are recited to them, theɣ challenge ⌜ɣou⌝, "We have alreadɣ heard ⌜the recitation⌝. If we wanted, we could have easilɣ produced something similar. This ⌜Quran⌝ is nothing but ancient fables!"
(8:31)

And when it is said to them, "What has ɣour Lord revealed?" Theɣ saɣ, "Ancient fables!"
(16:24)

And theɣ saɣ, "⌜These revelations are onlɣ⌝ ancient fables which he has had written down, and theɣ are rehearsed to him morning and evening."
(25:5)

We have alreadɣ been promised this, as well as our forefathers earlier. This is nothing but ancient fables!"
(23:83)

We have alreadɣ been promised this, as well as our forefathers earlier. This is nothing but ancient fables!"
(27:68)

But some scold their parents, "Enough with you! Are you warning me that I will be brought forth ˹from the grave˺, while many generations had already perished before me ˹for good˺?" The parents cry to Allah for help, ˹and warn their child,˺ "Pity you. Have faith! Surely Allah's promise is true." But the deniers insist, "This is nothing but ancient fables."
(46:17)

whenever Our revelations are recited to him, he says, "Ancient fables!"
(68:15)

Whenever Our revelations are recited to them, they say, "Ancient fables!"
(83:13).

The Islamic tradition even records a dramatic rebuttal to similar accusations of human authorship. In Sahih al-Bukhari a Christian convert who studied Surahs al-Baqara and Al-Imran and served as a scribe for the Prophet later apostatized, claiming Mohammad knew nothing but what he (the Christian) had taught him.

Narrated Anas:
There was a Christian who embraced Islam and read Surat-al-Baqara and Al-`Imran, and he used to write for the Prophet. Later on he returned to Christianity again and he used to say: "Muhammad knows nothing but what I have written for him." Then Allah caused him to die.....
https://sunnah.com/bukhari:3617

Chapter V
Bearing the Sins of Others within the Qur'an and Hadith

For this chapter I will be going over and establishing the fact that the Qur'an can't seem to decide whether or not if sins are personal or transferable. As the Qur'an repeatedly claims 'no bearer of burdens shall bear the burden of another'. One can say this is an oft-repeated statement within the Qur'an, (6:164) (35:18) (39:7) (53:38).

Say, ˹O Prophet,˺ "Should I seek a lord other than Allah while He is the Lord of everything?" No one will reap except what they sow. No soul burdened with sin will bear the burden of another. Then to your Lord is your return, and He will inform you of your differences.
(6:164)

No soul burdened with sin will bear the burden of another. And if a sin-burdened soul cries for help with its burden, none of it will be carried—even by a close relative. You ˹O Prophet˺ can only warn those who stand in awe of their Lord without seeing Him1 and establish prayer. Whoever purifies themselves, they only do so for their own good. And to Allah is the final return.
(35:18)

If you disbelieve, then ˹know that˺ Allah is truly not in need of you, nor does He approve of disbelief from His servants. But if you become grateful ˹through faith˺, He will appreciate that from you. No soul burdened with sin will bear the burden of another. Then to your Lord is your return, and He will inform you of what you used to do. He certainly knows best what is ˹hidden˺ in the heart.
(39:7)

⌜They state⌝ that no soul burdened with sin will bear the burden of another.
(53:38)

These verses do not stand alone as the Qur'an repeatedly declares the oft-repeated statement all over the Qur'an again and again take for example (4:111) (2:286)
And whoever commits a sin—it is only to their own loss. Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise.
(4:111)

Allah does not require of any soul more than what it can afford. All good will be for its own benefit, and all evil will be to its own loss. ⌜The believers pray,⌝ "Our Lord! Do not punish us if we forget or make a mistake. Our Lord! Do not place a burden on us like the one you placed on those before us. Our Lord! Do not burden us with what we cannot bear. Pardon us, forgive us, and have mercy on us. You are our ⌜only⌝ Guardian. So grant us victory over the disbelieving people."
(2:286)

Though some passages are more vague then others, the Qur'an's overall view is ultimately clear within all the aforementioned passages mentioned in this chapter. We can concur that the Qur'an ultimately states that a soul can not simply bear a burden, of a burdened soul. *Gabrial Said Raynold's* book *The Quran And The Bible* attributes passages (5:29) (6:31, 119)

to be loosely related to Biblical affirmations of people being responsible for their own committed sins, like Ezekiel 18:20. But I myself do acknowledge that these verses have a striking resemblance to passages like *Deuteronomy 24:16; Jeremiah 31:29-30; 2 Chronicles 25:4; James 1:14; Romans 2:6.*

But that is not why I am shining a light towards this concept, as it would have correctly been placed in the previous chapter if that was the case. The reason I made mention of all the aforementioned passages is to present evidence that the Qur'an appears to have a consistent principle across multiple verses that sins and their burdens are fundamentally personal and non-transferable. In the sense that there can not be any substitute for the original sinner. The repeated and oft-repeated statement of *"no bearer of burdens shall bear the burden of another"* or similar phrasings in the Qur'an serves as a foundational rejection of inherited sin, or any shifting of accountability for sin. As the Qur'an is abundantly clear that each soul shall reap what they sow. However with that being said there are two verses within the Qur'an that seem to completely ignore this principle and in doing so coughs up a terrible contradiction that many scholars have pointed out in various books. The two culprits in question are *(16:25)* and *(29:12-13)* where the Qur'an flips the script, suggesting that sins can be transferred or shared. Which would contradict it's own oft-repeated statement of
"no bearer of burdens shall bear the burden of another"

starting off we have in verse twenty-five of chapter sixteen the concept of transferring ones sin to those who have mislead them.
Let them bear their burdens in full on the Day of Judgment as well as some of the burdens of those they mislead without knowledge. Evil indeed is what they will bear!
(16:25)

The verse suggests that people who bear a full account of their own burdens will have other burdens placed upon them that are not their own but of those who they have mislead. Which is in direct contradiction to the oft-repeated statement of *"no bearer of burdens shall bear the burden of another"*. This is because in *16:25* it suggests that people who do bear burdens can bear the burden of another,

not only is it in contradiction with the oft-repeated statement but it is also in contradiction to *chapter seventeen verse fifteen (17:15*), because it seems to suggest that a person who misleads people will have the sins of those whom he misled put upon himself. Which would be contradicting *17:15* where being guided or being misled in error are personal affairs. Souly because of the reason that if one soul is bearing burdens he can not bear the burdens of others.

Whoever is guided is only guided for his soul. And whoever errs only errs against it. And no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another. And never would We punish until We sent a messenger.

(17:15)

Here the contradiction becomes undeniably clear presenting a solid case for the argument as it states ("whoever errs only errs against it"). Treating the action of being led astray as a purely individual matter while in contradiction 16:25 asserts that this is not the case and that those who mislead people will have extra sins be put upon them on the day of judgment adding onto the sins they already bore in full.

Let them bear their burdens in full on the Day of Judgment as well as some of the burdens of those they mislead

The two verses cannot coexist without one cancelling out the other. Either sins and their consequences are 100% personal and non-transferable (as 17:15 and *oft-repeated statement* refrain demand), or they can be partially shifted onto someone else in cases of misguidance (as 16:25 plainly asserts). Both cannot be true. If the words of the Qur'an can flip so blatantly on whether one soul can bear another's burden, the claim of perfect consistency (4:82) collapses under its own contradictions.

Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Had it been from anyone other than Allah, they would have certainly found in it many inconsistencies.
(4:82)

The contradiction does not end with 16:25 as it even gets worse in 29:12-13 where the Qur'an doubles down on the very idea it elsewhere denies forcefully.
And those who disbelieve say to those who believe, "Follow our way, and we will carry your sins." But they will not carry anything of their sins. Indeed, they are liars. But they will surely carry their [own] burdens and [other] burdens along with their burdens, and they will surely be questioned on the Day of Resurrection about what they used to invent.

The reason why this passage is so damning is because the disbelievers mockingly promise to *"carry your sins"* if the believers follow them, a false offer the Qur'an immediately exposes as a lie. But then comes around to say while they won't bear the believers' sins in the sense of relieving them, the disbelievers will end up carrying their own burdens and other burdens along with their own. The same text that just treated the concept of carrying ones sin as a blatant lie, but then admits within the next verse that the disbelievers will carry additional burdens on top of their own burdens that they will fully bear. It would also seem here that The Qur'an is trying to have it both ways as if it is trying to have its cake and eat it to. Anyone reading these passages with any sort of honesty would conclude that this would be a flat-out contradiction to a well established principle within the Qur'an. For the next portion of this chapter i will be delving into Hadith material that takes this contradiction to bad, to catastrophic for the Qur'anic claims of flawless consistency.

First i want to bring light to the Hadith where the prophet himself enforces the Qur'anic principle of the oft-repeated statement, within the Sunnah.

It was narrated from Al-Aswad bin Hilal - who met the Prophet - from a man from Banu Tha'labah bin Yarbu, that:
some people from Banu Tha'labah killed a man from among the companions of the Messenger of Allah. A man from among the companions of the Messenger of the Allah said: "O Messenger of Allah, these are Banu Tha'labah who killed so and so." The Messenger said: "No soul is affected by the sin of another." Shu'bah (one of the narrators) said: "That means: No soul is responsible for the sin of another, and Allah knows best."
https://sunnah.com/nasai:4836

Here we have the Prophet declaring the oft-repeated statement within the Sunnah stating ***"No soul is affected by the sin of another."*** . Shu'bah then clarifies that the statement of the prophet means *no one is held responsible for another's sin.* Addressing individual accountability with no room for exception. But then we have in other hadith's like *Sunan Ibn Majah 3958* where in a scenario of chaos, killing, and bloodshed, Muhammad tells the companion, if someone enters your house to kill you, let him carry his own sin and your sin, and he will be one of the people of the Hellfire. Directly contradicting his very own Sunnah and Qur'an.

It was narrated from Abu Dharr that the Messenger of Allah ((ﷺ said:"What will you do, O Abu Dharr, when death overwhelms the people to such an extent that a grave will be equal in value to a slave?" I said: "Whatever Allah and His Messenger choose for me, or Allah and His Messenger know best." He said "Be patient." He said: 'What will you do when famine strikes the people so that you will go to the place where you pray and will not be able to return to your bed,

or you will not be able to get up from your bed to go to the place where you pray?" He said: "I said: 'Allah and His Messenger know best, or whatever Allah and His Messenger choose for me." He said: "You must refrain from forbidden things." He said: "What will you do when killing befalls the people so that Hijaratuz-Zait*is covered with blood?" I said: "Whatever Allah and His Messenger choose for me." He said: "Stay with those whom you belong to." He said: "I said: 'O Messenger of Allah, should I not take my sword and strike those who do that?'" He said: "Then you will be just like the people. Rather enter your house." I said: "O Messenger of Allah, what if they enter my house?" He said: "If you are afraid that the flashing of the sword will dazzle you, then put the edge of your garment over your face, and let him carry his own sin and your sin, and he will be one of the people of the Hellfire."

https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:3958

These statements can not both be true as in one case it seems as though the prophet's declaration of ***"No soul is affected by the sin of another."*** would be cancelled out through this contradicting statement. That if his companion is scared of being killed he should hide his face and let the murderer carry out his sin, and in doing so the killer will carry upon himself his own sin and the sin of Mohammad's companion, and will be one of the people in hellfire. Which is quite humorous when you harmonize this hadith with *Sahih Muslim 1891a.* Where the prophet declares that a *kafr* and his killer will not be joined together in hellfire harmonizing both accounts it seems as though that in both cases if a *kafr* kills a Muslim or vice versa a Muslim kills a *kafr* the *kafr* in both cases will be taking upon himself the sins of the Muslim which is baffling to say the least.

It has been narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger Allah (ﷺ) said:

A disbeliever and a believer who killed him will never be gathered together in Hell.

https://sunnah.com/muslim:1891a

There is another hadith within *Sahih Muslim* which becomes most damaging as it is the most indefensible hadith in the entire collection when it comes to the oft-repeated statement contradiction. In a certain hadith we have Mohammad declaring that on the day of resurrection Allah will hand every Muslim a Jew or a Christian and say *"this is your ransom from hellfire"* In the parallel narration, Allah forgives Muslims whose sins are as heavy as mountains, and places those sins on the Jews and Christians in their stead.

SAHIH HADITH:

Abu Burda reported Allah's Messenger (صلى‌الله عليه وسلم) as saying: There would come people amongst the Muslims on the Day of Resurrection with as heavy sins as a mountain, and Allah would forgive them and He would place in their stead the Jews and the Christians. (As far as I think), Abu Raub said: I do not know as to who is in doubt. Abu Burda said: I narrated it to 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, whereupon he said:

Was it your father who narrated it to you from Allah's Apostle (صلى‌الله عليه وسلم)? I said: Yes.

REFERENCE: sahih al muslim 2: Chapter 150, Hadith 7014

https://www.islamicfinder.org/hadith/muslim/repentance/7014/

/

Sahih Muslim Book - 49, Hadith - 7011 ***حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرِ بْنُ أَبِى شَيْبَةَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو أُسَامَةَ عَنْ طَلْحَةَ بْنِ يَحْيَى عَنْ أَبِى بُرْدَةَ عَنْ أَبِى مُوسَى قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ - صلى‌الله عليه وسلم- « إِذَا كَانَ يَوْمُ الْقِيَامَةِ دَفَعَ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ إِلَى كُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ يَهُودِيًّا أَوْ نَصْرَانِيًّا فَيَقُولُ هَذَا فِكَاكُكَ مِنَ النَّارِ ».***

It was narrated that Abu Musa said: "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: 'When the Day of Resurrection comes, Allah, Glorified and Exalted is He, will give every Muslim a Jew or a Christian, and He will say: "This is your ransom from the Fire"

https://www.alim.org/hadith/sahih-muslim/49/7011/

These hadith's, I felt, could not be ignored within this chapter as the weight they hold to such a discussion as this. Here, it shows complete substitution for sin bearing without any sort of hold back. This would be in the most literal sense of substitution, as here with these hadiths it seems that the Muslims will come to their God on the day of judgment with sins that weigh as heavy as mountains, and will have their sins transferred directly onto the Jews and Christians as a ransom mechanism for Muslims to escape hellfire. This would go against the oft-repeated principle of the Qur'an and in the Sunnah, yet they are verifiable and have authentic chains going back to the prophet, giving us an overwhelming contradiction that I myself have spent months on end debating Muslims on, exhausting myself with every source to get little to no explanation from my fellow Muslims. This is precisely the reason why I gave this matter attention within my book. Much deserved attention at that, as I rarely see this topic being discussed much when the topic of contradictions are being addressed. On that note, I do feel as though that this chapter succeeded in what it was intended for, to equip the common reader with enough material for such an overwhelming contradiction so that they themselves can be well grounded within their own debates and discussions confidently.

Epilogue

As we have observed throughout the entirety of this book, Islam not only borrowed from pre-Islamic paganism, folkloric tales and myths, but also has problematic contradictions found within all of its most sacred texts. Nothing to do with this Islam is original in any sense. An overview of what this otherworldly thing which calls itself Islam can be thoroughly explained just by grasping the essential point of how it emerged, from whence it emerged, and from whom it emerged.

Mohammad himself was brought up by pagans, within a pagan environment. This pagan environment is the direct source for many of Islamic practices that are still observed today. Mohammad conquered the pagan shrine of his own tribesmen within Mecca *(The Kaaba)* and preserved all the practices that predated Islam which were observed. It would get quite exhausting to go over each and every single influence that developed Islam to what it is as this book only goes over a few out of the many cases.